ذكر فتح الاندلس

IBN ABD-EL-HAKEM'S HISTORY OF THE CONQUEST OF SPAIN.

NOW EDITED FOR THE FIRST TIME,

TRANSLATED FROM THE ARABIC,

WITH CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL NOTES, AND A HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION,

BY

JOHN HARRIS JONES,

PH. D. & M. A. OF THE UNIVERSITY OF GOETTINGEN.

GOETTINGEN, 1858. LONDON,

DIETERICH. WILLIAMS & NORGATE.

GOETTINGEN,

PRINTED BY W. FR. KAESTNER.

(DIETERICH'S UNIVERSITY PRESS.)

Preface.

In presenting this treatise before the public a few words of explanation are deemed necessary. Being desirous that the Arabic text which is herewith given, should exhibit a faithful transcript of Ibn Abd El-Hakem's ms., we have retained in the former certain forms of expression which are not commonly used by other authors. The learned reader will not take exception to these words, when he is apprized that they form a part of the peculiar style of Ibn Abd El-Hakem. A strict adherence to the original has been observed in the translation so far as the same was practicable. There are instances in which we have had recourse to a free translation, perceiving that a literal one would be somewhat unintelligible to those not conversant with the Arabic. In the exegetical notes the statements of our author are compared with those of other writers; and whenever they seem to differ, an attempt is made to reconcile them. Our investigations are based chiefly on the documents which have lately been published, either in the original texts or in the translations. These for the most part, were not used by our predecessors. Though these sources enable us to obtain satisfactory results on many questions, on others they merely serve to increase the difficulties; for their statements are at variance with those of other ancient writers. The present treatise is chiefly occupied with the solution of these difficulties. In conducting our inquiries we were guided by the consideration, that, in order to reconcile the discrepancies of the original sources on particular points, regard must be paid to the history of a whole period; and that, when two traditions contradict each other, the preference should be given to the one which involves the least difficulties, and which alone

enables us to account for the origin of the other. A slight perusal of the following pages will be sufficient to make the reader acquainted with the principles which have guided us in our investigations. Due regard has been paid to the distinct merits of various authors, and their statements have been tested by the claims which these present upon our consideration. The testimony of no author, however high his authority, has been deemed infallible. Ibn Abd El-Hakem has been summoned before the same tribunal as the other authors with whose statements the opinions of the former are at variance. And notwithstanding his high claims to attention on account both of the age in which he lived and of the merits he possesses as an author, still his testimony has not always been received as correct.

The peculiarities of this treatise consist in independent investigations of the original documents lately brought into light, and in arranging the facts which these and others contain in such a manner, as to meet the difficulties which a comparison of these sources exhibits. The conclusions at which we have arrived, in some instances agree with those of our predecessors, still the premises from which these have been drawn, differ from theirs. The results of our investigations are not so new, as the method by which they have been obtained. This was to be expected from the nature of the case; for the accounts given in the sources lately discovered, differ so much from the traditions of other trustworthy authorities, that one modern writer, on consulting both, has been led in many instances to reject the testimony of the latter, and to construct his theories entirely on the statements of the former. This he has done, taking into account the general merits of individual authors, rather than the weight which is to be attached to their testimony in particular cases. His predecessors, on the other hand, pursued their investigations without consulting some of the most important original documents, these being at the time but little known.

In the following pages constant references are made to the opinions of modern authors, as well as to the facts which are recorded in the ancient sources. The treatise would per-

haps be more attractive to a certain class of readers, if the results of our investigations were communicated in the narrative form, and the investigations themselves conducted in the exegetical notes: for in the latter the transition from one subject to another is often so abrupt as not to be pleasing; whereas in the former the subjects might be changed without attracting necessarily the reader's attention. — He would thus be imperceptibly carried forward by the flow of the discourse; and would first be aware of the progress he had made, when he should have arrived at the end. Many have an antipathy to all kinds of learned commentaries: they contend themselves with knowing results, disregarding altogether the processes by which these have been obtained. But he who is inspired with true love for science, knows how to appreciate inquiries after truth as how to value truth itself. Truth is to him its own reward. He is thus doubly recompenced, first, by the search, and secondly by the attainment.

In correcting the first proof-sheet we wrote the proper name Ibn Elkouthiya, with the letter y before the letter i: this method of spelling the word is true is not exactly wrong, still, on a maturer consideration, we cannot but deem the orthography followed in the other parts of the treatise, preferable. We made the alteration in the first instance, following the authority of M. Cherbonneau; not, however, taking into consideration that we were acting inconsistent with ourselves in departing in one particular instance from a method which we had all but universally adopted in similar cases. The same observation is applicable to the name Ifrikiya, in which case also the letter i should precede the letter y. The learned reader need not to be informed that it is extremely difficult to express in German or English characters many sounds of the Arabic alphabet; for the former possess very imperfect means of communicating the peculiar Arabic modifications of the Dentals, of the Linguals, and of the Gutturals. Hence Oriental Scholars employ different characters to represent the powers of these letters. One instance connected with the history of the conquest of Andalus will suffice as an illustration. — The governor Han'tala is called Hanzala by Weil, Handala by De

Slane, Hondhalah by De Gayangos, Hanthala by Lembke, and Hantala by Aschbach. We have distinguished ظ from ط and ت by simply marking the English *t*, knowing that our language is incapable of expressing the peculiar sound of the former letter. It is much to be regretted that a certain formula has not been universally agreed upon in reference to the proper method of rendering the Arabic proper names into another language; and that Oriental Scholars have not paid to this subject the attention which is due to its importance. Systems, however, have been established for this purpose, but these are so defective that they are not followed even by those who introduced them.

This treatise having been printed on the Continent, we solicit the indulgence of the English readers for any typographical errors which may inadvertently have crept into the work. Indeed most of these are so palpable that it would be absurd to suppose for a moment that they are mistakes of ours.

In conclusion, I take this opportunity of acknowledging my great and many obligations to Professor Ewald, under whose direction I have pursued my studies in the Oriental languages, and whose efficiency as a *Teacher* is even worthy of his importance as an *Investigator* in that department.

Goettingen, June the 10th. 1858.

Contents.

	Page
Preface	— III—VI
Historical Introduction	— 1—17
Translation	— 18—43
Exegetical notes	— 44—81
Arabic text	— ١—٢٧

Historical Introduction.

Historical investigations can only be conducted with success, when original documents are consulted, and a true estimate formed of their respective value. The historian must investigate the original sources, in order to obtain materials for his work; for matters of fact are the foundation of all history. A judicious arrangement of these, and their impartial narration cannot but enhance the value of a work, the chief merits of which depend upon the materials and upon the skill displayed in using them. However ample and reliable the former may be, skill must be called into play by the historian. This is used to good purpose, whenever employed in tracing the connexion between the events of the past, so as to present them in that order in which they occurred. The historian cannot restore the natural order of events unless he discovers their eternal fitness, as well as their mutual influence upon each other. This is his most noble, and at the same time his most difficult task.

Many authors entertain, not only foolish, but really dishonest objections to acknowledge the sources whence they derive valuable information. In some cases the citation of authorities adds but little to the merits of a work. In others a constant reference to the original sources is necessary as well as desirable; for by that means the author is enabled to prove the correctness of his views, and the reader is placed in a better position to judge of the merits of the work.

That period of the history of Spain, which we are about to treat, demands the utmost care in the perusal of the original documents, as well as a judicious arrangement of the materials they contain, in order to clear up the obscurity in

which this period is enveloped. The difficulties which a historian of the Mohammedan conquest of Spain has to contend with, arise partly from the contradictory statements in the original sources, and partly from the silence observed by these on some important questions. From one or other of these causes, or from a combination of both, the period of Spanish history during which the country was governed by the house of the Umaiyad, is one of the most obscure which falls within the department of serious history. And notwithstanding the confusion and uncertainty which still prevail on particular points, it must be admitted that this history as a whole is now better understood than it was formerly. That the publication of ancient documents has contributed greatly to this happy result, may be learnt from a moderate acquaintance with the literature of the period in question. It is a cheering incident, that a work which only half a century ago was regarded as the most satisfactory record of this period, both on account of its extensive use of the original documents, as well as the accuracy of the results it presented, has been so far excelled by others of a later date that the defects of the former are now generally acknowledged. This affords a proof of the progress made in clearing up the obscurity hanging over the subject. Though Conde's work (for to this we allude) made an epoch on its first appearance, and contains much rare information which may be turned to good purpose by the historian of the present day, still its numerous blunders and contradictions, its entire want of critical notes, and the uncouth arrangement of its materials, are defects which cannot fail to attract the attention of the scholar, and diminish considerably the value of the work in his estimation; though they have escaped the observation of certain class of readers.

We deem it unnecessary to discuss the merits of the early sources of this history the general character of which may be supposed to be sufficiently known. But the original documents which have been lately discovered, and the works which have been lately published, call for especial notice. To these we have frequent occassion to refer in the notes.

We commence the review of the sources by giving a short

account of the most ancient and in many respects the most trustworthy authority on the history of the period in question; — the work of *Ibn Abd-El-Hakem*!

The name of this author written fully is as follows. — Abd-Errahman Ibn-Abd-El-Hakem. He was a native of Egypt, and died in the year A. H. 257 (A, D 870—1) and was interred at the south side of his fathers tomb at old Cairo. He was a Traditionist and a Historian and wrote two works, — one a History of Egypt, a part of which work was published by Dr. Karle *), the other a History of the Mohammedan Conquest of Spain, which is now edited for the first time. The manuscript a copy of which is herewith given is a continuation of the History of the Conquest of Ifrikyia, which has been twice translated into French by De. Slane. The first of these translations appeared in the Journal Asiatique in the year 1844; and the second in an Appendix to the translation of Ibn Khaldun on the History of the Berbers in the year 1852. The original mss. Nr. 655 and 785 of this work, are in the National Library in Paris; and were copied by Professor Ewald in the year 1829. It is through the kindness of this truly distingnished man in placing his copy at my disposal that I was enabled to undertake the task of editing the present work.

Ibn Abd-El-Hakem, in common with many other Mohammedan writers, commences the history of the conquest of Spain by recounting briefly the circumstances connected with the history of Ifrikyia which led to the invasion of Andalus; and throughout the work the author gives a somewhat detailed account of the manner in which the administration of Ifrikyia was conducted, up to the time of the overthrow of the dynasty of the Umaiyad. That he should have related the history of both provinces in connexion with each other, was the more proper and necessary, as the relation between both was such, as to render a separate history of the one without any reference to that of the other, not only not desirable but even impossible; for Spain for the time being, was a Mohammedan province,

---

*) Under the title Ibn Abdolhakami Libellus de Historia Aegypti Antiqua. *Gottingae* sumtibus Dieterichianis, 1856.

subject to the rule of the governors of Ifrikyia, who appointed and deposed the rulers of Andalus, in compliance with the dictates of their own arbitrary will.

The expedition into Spain was undertaken by the Moslems at a period, when their authority in Ifrikyia was so firmly established, that the Berber tribes, refractory as they were, did not venture to dispute this supremacy for the space of twelve years. At the expiration of that time, an insurrection instigated and headed by Meisara the „ignoble“ broke out, which after many bloody encounters was at length suppressed by the governor Hantala. The consequence of this revolt in Ifrikyia was the rebellion of the Berbers in Spain, who taking advantage of the critical state of the country endeavoured to shake off the yoke of the Arabs, and make themselves masters of the province. This insurrection having failed of its object, and the differences of the parties having been adjusted, Andalus again enjoyed the blessings of peace which however was of a short duration, as the Arabs soon after that began to grow dissatisfied and quarrelled among themselves. The consequences of this dissatisfaction belonging to a later period of Spanish history cannot here be entered upon.

Ibn Abd-El-Hakem, after giving a concise account of the landing in Spain of the two governors — Tarik and Musa, their march through the country, their return to the East, and their mutual recriminations in the presence of the Khalif, proceeds with the history of Ifrikyia withont even referring to that of Spain for the period of eight years, viz. from the year 97 to the year 105. At the end of which time resuming the narrative of the history of Spain, he makes two statements, one of which is irreconcilable with the unanimous testimony of other writers; the other corroborated by only one authority. We refer to his statement relative to the time of Anbasa's accession to power, and to the name of his immediate predecessor. But as these two points are discussed at full length in the notes, it is not necessary that we should take any further notice of them in the Introduction.

From the above-mentioned period to the end of his work Ibn Abd-El-Hakem is so much occupied with the history of

Ifrikyia, that he allows the reader only occasional glimpses into that of Spain. He does not even mention the name of the last governor of Andalus under the dynasty of the Umaiyad, but closes the work by recounting the disturbances of the Berbers in Ifrikyia during the administration of Abd-Errahman Ibn Habib, who after endeavouring in vain to make himself master of Spain, succeeded in obtaining the highest authority in Ifrikiya.

From a slight perusal of the ms. and the sketch we have just drawn of its contents, it will be seen that the chief merit of the work consists in its being a faithful chronicle of events as recorded in the best traditions, which had come down to our author from his ancestors.

That the work is wanting in unity of plan, is deficient in minute details, and is incomplete as the history of the period of which it treats, are defects which it has in common with other Arabic works of the same age. Indeed the art of writing history had then made but little progress among the Moslems, and the accuracy for which their works became justly renowned at a later period is missed in a great measure in their earlier histories. This is the chief cause of the obscurity which still prevails on the history of the Mohammedan conquest of Spain.

Ibn El-Kouthyia's work Entitled Fotouh Elandalos Lilmoslimin. This is in ms. in the Imperial Library of Paris. Extracts from it translated into French, appeared in the Journal Asiatique (Avril — Mai) 1853, and (Nov. — Oct.) 1856: the translator being M. Cherbonneau. This work recommends itself to our especial consideration by its antiquity, as well as by the fact that the author was equally related to both parties concerned in the conquest of Andalus. The author, whose name was Abu Becr Mohammed Ibn Omar, Ibn Abd Elaziz, Ibn Ibrahim, Ibn Aisa, Ibn Mozahim, lived within a hundred years of the events he records in his history; and was by the paternal side a descendant of an Arabic Prince, and by the maternal of a Gothic Princess. This circumstance tends to awaken in the reader a lively interest for the author, and to inspire confidence in the impartiality of his narrative. Ibn El-Kouthyia's mother was the Christian Princess Sarah the grand-daughter of Witiza,

one of the last kings of the Goths. Being deprived by her uncle Ardebast of her dominions, this Princess went to the East to complain to the Khalif Hisham Ibn Abd El-Melik of the injustice she was suffering at the hands of her relative. This application met with its desired effect; for the Khalif perceiving the justice of her claim as well as her courage, was easily persuaded to grant to her a restitution of her rights. He gave her at the same time in marriage to a Prince of the family of the Umaiyad (the then ruling dynasty in the East), of the name of Aisa Ibn Mozahim. The issue of this marriage was Ibn El-Kouthyia, who lived first at Seville, and afterwards removed to Cordova where his family were residing. In his youth he attended the lectures of several learned men, extracts from which he published in the work now under consideration. He is also the author of a treatise on the Arabic conjugation, and was acknowledged to be one of the most learned men of the age. He died in Cordova on the 23rd of Rebia the first, of the year A. H. 376. A. D. 877.

Not having seen the original text of this work we deem it but just to quote the words of the translator, who in the Journal Asiatique *) expresses himself as to the general character of the author in the following manner. Ibn El-Kouthyia unit avec bonheur le talent du conteur a la gravité de l'historien. On regrette cependant que son livr, si interessant d'ailleurs offre plutôt un ensemble varié d'erudition, qu' une histoire raisonnée. On voudrait y trouver la philosophie de faits a côte de ce que j'appellerai le pittoresque. Le Style d'Ibn-El-Kouthyia est essentiellement Arabe, et brille autant par la propriéte de mots que par le laconisme de la phrase. See further M. Dozy Histoire de l'Afrique et de l'Espagne, entitled Albayano'l Mogreb se t. I. p. 28—30. Reinaud Invasion des Sarrasins en France p. 6.

The work of Tabari Entitled Annals of the Kings and the ambassadors of God is in ms. in the University Library of Berlin. Professor Ewald made a copy of it which he kindly lent to us while the present treatise was preparing for publication.

Abu Jaafar Muhammed Ibn Jarir Ibn Jezid Ibn Khalid At-

*) Ser. 5. Tom. 8. 1856.

Tabari (a native of Taberestan) was an *Imam* („master of the highest authority)" in various branches of knoweldge such as Koranic interpretation, traditions, jurisprudence, history, and was the author of the great commentary on the Koran, and the celebrated work now under consideration. These productions bear testimony to his extensive information, and great abilities. He was born A. H. 224 (A. D. 838—9) at Amul in Taberestan, and died in Baghdad on the 25 th. of Shawwal A. H. 310 (Feb. A. D. 923) See Ibn Khallikan Vol. I. p. 597. Et-Taberi annales regum atque legatorum Dei editt Kosegarten.

As the work of Et-Tabari contains but occasional references to the history of Spain within the period in question, we must content ourselves with giving a summary account of its character. It will be seen from our notes, that in most cases Tabari agrees with Ibn Abd-El-Hakem. Indeed the general similarity of views of both authors is such as only to be accounted for on the supposition, that both borrowed their materials from the same original sources. In this case the testimony of Tabari is especially valuable, as it gives an additional weight to the evidence already given by Ibn Abd-El-Hakem. The different views of these authors on some few questions, arose probably from the circumstance of their having followed different traditions. Both are slaves of their materials, merely narrating the facts which were originally recorded in the ancient Chronicles. These are no longer extant. There is such a childlike simplicity about the narratives of these authors as to justify us in reposing entire confidence in their honesty; though we do not feel so sure that they themselves were not imposed upon.

Et-Tabari furnishes us with rare and valuable information on many points connected with the history of the period in question; but as these are not referred to in the work of Ibn Abd-El-Hakem we do not notice them.

Ibn Khaldun's History of the Berbers and of the Mohammedan Dynasties in Northern Africa. The original text of this work was edited by De Slane, and the first Vol. published in the year 1847, and the second in the year 1851. Moreover a translation of the same work into French was published by the

same author, and illustrated with notes which render it so much the more valuable. In the appendix thereto he has added further translations from other authors. Abu Zeid Abd Errahman Ibn Khaldun was born in Tunis on the first of Ramadan A. H. 732. (A. D. 1332). He belonged to a noble Arabic family, the ancestor of which Ouail Ibn Hodjr a prince of the tribe of Kinda, embraced Islamism in the 10 th year of the Hidjra *). In his youth Ibn Khaldun was distinguished for his great love of learning, in the pursuit whereof he travelled extensively. He is the author of several works, of which, besides the one already mentioned, the History of Africa under the dynasty of the Aghlabites was translated into French by M. Noel Desvergers **).

Independently of the importance of the work of Ibn Khaldun as our chief and even our only trustworthy authority on the history of the Berbers, his production deserves on other grounds to be especially mentioned. It contains, besides other matters, a narrative of the wars between the Berbers and the Arabs prior to the final conquest of Ifrikyia by the latter, as well as a full account of the insurrections of the former during the administration of the last governors of the province Ifrikyia under the dynasty of the Umaiyad. The most important events which occurred in Ifrikyia during that period are contained in the history of these wars. The work has the peculiarity of following each tribe historically from its origin.

Ibn Khaldun writes the history of the insurrection of the Berbers from a different point of view from that, from which the events have been narrated and commented upon by other writers. When the Berbers remain quiet under the yoke of the Arabs no mention is made of their history; when they exert themselves to shake off this yoke, the circumstances under which this occurs are given in detail.

This work is especially important as it enables us to speak with certainty of the various names of the Berber tribes, as

---

*) See l'Essai sur l'histoire des Arabes avant l'islamisme de M. C. de Perceval, t. III, p. 293; Paris, 1847.

**) Histoire de l'Afrique sous la dynastie des Aghlabites Paris, 1841.

well as of their respective origins: and this sort of information is the more to be valued in the preseat case, inasmuch as great uncertainty hitherto prevailed on these subjects; and authors had no means of clearing up this obscurity, for their knowledge of Ibn Khaldun's work was chiefly confined to the extracts given from it by De Sacy*), who translated some of this historian's writings. We still regret that we cannot vouch for the correctness of the names of many of the Berber tribes, because they are variously given in different Mss.

This work exhibits also great diligence in the use of the ancient sources, and the author cites frely his authorities. Ibn Abd El-Hakem is often quoted. In comparing the work of Ibn Khaldun with that of Nuweiri we cannot but be struck by the agreement of both authors on most points relative to the history in question: the harmony extending occasionally even to the very words. Compare especially Ibn Khaldun's in Slane's translation Vol. I. p. 217—19; and Nuweiri in the Appendix to the same Vol. p. 361—64.

To account for this agreement, we must suppose either that both authors have borrowed their materials from the same original sources, or that the one has borrowed from the other. If the latter supposition is correct, Ibn Khaldun must have borrowed from Nuweiri; for the latter died in the very year in which the former was born.

De Slane has made a valuable contribution to the history of the Mohammedan conquest of Spain in translating the work of Ibn Khaldun; and especially in adding in an Appendix to to the first Vol. a translation of the work of Nuweiri; which though it appeared originally in the Journal Asiatique 1844. was not then illustrated with the notes with which it is now accompanied. In these notes De Slane has compared the work of Ibn Abd El-Hakem with that of Nuweiri: but instead of grappling with the difficulties which a comparison of the two works might have suggested to him, the author has contented him-

*) See Chrest. Arab. t. I, p. 370—411; and t. II, p. 279—336; 2 Ed. 1826. and Relation de l'Egypte, par Abd-Allatif, trad. par De Sacy, p. 509—24.

self with stating their discrepancies without even attempting to reconcile their different statements. This is indeed the more remarkable, as Weil (Geschichte der Chalifen) had frequently pointed out the difficulties, though he was not equally successful in solving them. There was therefore the more need, that a new investigator in this field of history, furnished with new materials for his work, should address himself with zeal to the solution of those problems, the difficulties of which had either failed to attract the attention of his predecessors, or had been handled by them in an unsatisfactory manner.

Pascual de Gayangos' Translation of El-Makkari's History of the Mohammedan Dynasties in Spain. The first Vol. of this work was published in the year 1840, and the second in the year 1843. To each Vol. are added Appendices which contain translation of several documents hitherto unpublished. It is the importance of these that induces us to call the reader's attention to the translation of El-Makkari's work rather than to the original text edited by Krehl, Wright, and others. Each Vol. is illustrated with notes in which the author discusses the difficulties arising from the contradictory statements in the original sources. How far he has been successful in solving these difficulties will be seen from a perusal of our notes. One special merit attaching to this work, is that it points out more definitely than its predecessors the localities in Spain, which were the scenes of many an important event during the Mohammedan conquest. The author could the more easily do this, being himself a native of the country. The degree of praise he deserves is in proportion to the difficulty of the task. Before the publication of his work this subject was enveloped in great obscurity, arising chiefly from the fact that the places most frequently mentioned in the history of the Mohammedan conquest have changed their names in the course of centuries. Different places assumed at a later period those very names by which other localities were known in ancient time. Hence the difficulty of removing the confusion which prevailed on this subject.

The author consulted extensively the Arabic sources, in search whereof he visited several countries of Europe. The

Arabic documents are more important to the Historian of the Mohammedan conquest of Spain than all others; for the latter are more or less borrowed from the former. The ancient mss. lately discovered enable us to speak with certainty concerning many points which De Gayangos has called in question. This is another proof of the progress made in the investigation of this history. We do not feel confident that the author has always made the best use of his materials; for he has sometimes drawn conclusions which, upon a careful comparison of his authorities, do not seem warranted. Some of the difficulties connected with this history seem to have altogether escaped his notice. The defects of this work have been amply supplied by another book which has been more recently published. We mean, *Weil Geschichte der Chalifen.*

The first Vol. which contains, among other matters, a history of the period in question, was published in the year 1847. With the other Vols. which have no reference to this history we have no concern — nor indeed with the general character of the work. We therefore confine our observations to that part of the first Vol. which treats of the history of Spain and Ifrikyia under the dynasty of the Umaiyad. A narrative of even the most important events in these provinces, could find only a subordinate place in a work which was expressly written on the history of the Khalifs. This circumstance is sufficient to account for the want of unity which the work exhibits in reference to the history of the Mohammedan conquest. This latter is not given consecutively; for the author looks at the scattered events of the world in their relation to the history of the Khalifs. Regarding then his production from this point of view we shall not find it deficient in unity of plan.

The work exhibits great diligence in the use of the original sources, as well as great skill in giving in a concise form the results obtained from sources lately discovered. On many questions Weil has thrown a new light, and has also occasionally corrected the errors which had crept into the work of De Gayangos and into those of others. No one can but admire the learning, the diligence, and the accuracy which this work

exhibits. Indeed it possesses these qualities in so eminent a degree that it renders its authority more trustworthy than any of its predecessors, and recommends its records to the special attention of the future historian. With all these excellencies it has its defects. Among these may be mentioned the fondness the author betrays for calling in question the correctness of the results which his predecessors had obtained, as well as the endeavour to establish new theories on too slender foundations. A calmer and a deeper reflexion on the points at issue between him and his predecessors, might have led him to modify the views of the latter without rejecting them altogether as incorrect. He pays too much deference to certain authorities to the exclusion of others who have equal claims upon his attention. Weil has so far the advantage of his opponents, that he has consulted several important documents which were inaccessible to them. He was thus in a position to point out the difficulties which seemed to militate against their conclusions. Were he equally successful in solving these difficulties as in calling attention to them, the value of his work would be much enhanced. His book exhibits great skill in the treatment of single questions, but is somewhat deficient in a comprehen sive view of a whole period. The immediate connexion of events is taken in at a glance, but these do not seem to be considered with reference to the past, the present, and the future. The justness of these remarks will be made evident in our notes. They require therefore no illustration in this place.

There are one or two inaccuracies in the citations — a circumstance not be wondered at, when we consider the number of authorities which the learned author consulted for his work.

When a part of this treatise was already in the Printer's hand, we received another work, which as it also treats of the conquest of Spain and Ifrikyia, should not he passed unnoticed. We mean „*Etude sur La Conquête De L'Afrique Par Les Arabes, Et Recherches sur Les Tribus Berberes Qui ont occupé Le Magreb Central, Par Henri Fournel.* Paris, 1857.

Knowing that the literature of this history had been lately enriched by the publication of rare documents, we naturally

expected that a new work on the subject would throw new light on some obscure points hitherto imperfectly understood. Our expectations were raised still higher on seeing the numerous quotations with which this work is furnished. But we confess to having experienced a little disappointment upon examining more minutely the results of the author's investigations.

1. Fournel has neglected consulting some of the most trustworthy of the original sources, among which may be mentioned Ibn El-Kouthyia, El-Tabari, Ibn Abd-El-Hakem. We have already seen that these are the most ancient documents now extant on the history of the Mohammedan conquest, and have been the most recently discovered. Their importance is in proportion to their antiquity, and to the rare information they contain. A work which has no reference to them is necessarily incomplete as a historical record of the events it recounts, and is even inferior in scientific value to other works of earlier date; for it not only fails in producing any thing new, but it also ignores the results of the latest investigations. This latter defect might to some degree have heen supplied, had the author been acquainted with Weil's Geschichte der Chalifen, and De Gayangos' translation of El-Makkari. These have discussed satisfactorily many questions on which Fournel has independently of théir investigations obtained the same results. The merit then attaching to his work is more relative than absolute, as his investigations tend to corroborate the correctness of the conclusions already arrived at, rather than give the right solution of those problems the difficulties of which had not been previously surmounted.

2. The work is chiefly based on the Latin documents and on the translations of the Arabic. The author's partiality to the first has led him to consult some original sources which had been comparatively neglected by others. We refer especially to the „Chronicon Albadense vel Aemilianense", and the Chronicle altributed to Alphonso III. King of Asturia, and Baronii Annales Ecclesiastici with notes by Pagi. The importance attaching to these Chronicles arises from the fact of both having been written in the 9th century. This edition of Baronius is

especially valuable on account of its rich collection of materials gathered from different Latin documents.

The author's diligence in the use of the Arabic translations deserves all praise; though it would have been preferable had he consulted the original texts; for in that case he might have laid claims to original investigations, instead of being dependent upon second hand sources for his materials. Though a resident of Paris, Fournel has contented himself with deriving his knowledge of the work of Ibn Abd-El-Hakem from the brief notices and extracts which are given by De Slane in an appendix to the translation of Ibn Khaldun's History of the Berbers. This is the more to be regretted, as the few errors which have inadvertently crept into the latter work have also been incorporated in that of Fournel. Whereas had he consulten the original mss. of Ibn Abd-El-Hakem's work he might have avoided these mistakes, which the longer they are allowed to exist, the more authority they obtain. So long as authors spare themselves the trouble of investigating the ancient documents in the original texts, so long we may despair of their being successful in communicating any thing new. Their productions denote regress rather than progress; we cannot hope to secure the latter hy reposing implicit confidence in translations. Investigations of the original sources, conducted in the right spirit, are the most effectual means of eradicating errors and of advancing historical science. We cannot but envy Fournel's opportunities of consulting the Arabic mss., which the Libraries of Paris amply afford, but which in his case seem to have been neglected.

3. The author does not seem to have formed a proper idea of the relative value of the documents he has consulted, for some of his conclusions are based on the testimony of those whose evidence cannot be always relied upon. One instance will suffice as an illustration. Fournel pronounces the history of Ilyan's daughter fabulous, because Masdeu and Conde have rejected it as incorrect. He obviously has not taken into consideration, that the evidence borrowed from each of these writers should always be received with caution; for the one is sceptical on many points now considered fully settled, and the

other is far from fulfilling the exspectations of the scholar. There are however cases in which the testimony of these authors may be valuable, especially when it *corroborates* the evidence given by the higher authorities, or at least is not at *variance* with the latter; but when (as in the present instance) it militates against what is almost the unanimous testimony of the best Arabic documents we cannot regard it otherwise than false. Distinction must be always made between the original sources, and the works which profess to be founded upon them; the latter may surpass the former as a work of art — as coming nearer to the ideal of history, but the former excel the latter in being a more faithful chronicle of the events of the past. The one is valuable for matters of fact, the other for matters of opinion. Their merit is therefore to be judged of by a different standard. When however their statements differ, there can be no question as to which we should follow; for the importance attaching to an author's testimony arises chiefly from the fact of his having himself lived near the time of the events which he describes in his history.

4. The author is guilty of an orthographical error, when he writes the word Umaiyad with two m. Ewald in Schmidt's Zeitschrift für Geschichts Wissenschaft*) has proved this to be contrary to all analogy, and has introduced the correct method of spelling this word, and which, since the publication of his article, has been all but universally adopted in Germany. Had Fournel been but slightly acquainted with the „Deutsche Wissenschaft" he might have avoided this error, and have improved his book in many other respects.

We need searcely add in conclusion, that the above remarks are only applicable to that part of Fournel's work, which treats of the history of Spain and Ifrikyia. It would be foreign to

*) Band I. p. 172. Ewald in reviewing Weil's Life of Mohammed, says: Man wird es auch besonders schätzen, dass der Verfasser auf die richtige Aussprache der Eigennamen allen Fleiss gewandt hat; nur warum er den Namen Omaija überall nach der bisher allerdings ganz gewöhnlichen Weise Ommejja mit doppeltem m schreibt, hätte erklärt werden müssen, da nicht nur der Qamus sondern andere Gründe z. B. die Etymologie gegen die Verdoppelung des m sprechen.

our present business to discuss in a scientific point of view the merits of the other parts.

We have now finished our notice of the chief works referred to in the following pages, and which we found it expedient to consult with the view of preparing the present treatise for publication. There are other books often quoted in our notes, which, though possessing considerable merit, cannot be taken notice of in our introduction. We refer especially to „*Lembke's Geschichte von Spanien*" — a work though published some time ago, will amply repay a perusal by the historian of the present day.

Though much has been already done towards elucidating this period of Spanish history, yet all the difficulties are so far from being solved that much still remains to be accomplished by some future historian. The discovery of other ancient mss· may contribute not a little, to throw a new light on many points which have been hitherto enveloped in obscurity, and may serve to confirm or refute those conjectures, which have been made with the view of reconciling the contradictory statements of different authors. Nevertheless the success of the future historian of this period will not depend so much on a rich collection of materials, as on their judicious arrangement. He must not only perceive wherein testimonies conflict, but he must also reconcile their differences; though in so doing he may expose himself to the charge of contradicting himself. He can only hope to surmount the difficulties, when he has a deeper insight even than that of the authors themselves, into the meaning of the original sources. He should supply the defects of these by exhibiting the connexion of the events, which if considered singly, cannot but appear obscure, and which, in order to be properly understood, require to be read by the reflected light of the past, the present, and the future. To trace this connexion is to discover the secrets of history. These are no other than the ideas which are the immediate cause of the facts of history, as well as the connecting link which binds them together. The author who investigates their origin and efficiency, their development and disappearance, uses his materials with the hand of a master, and with a freedom unknown to the bare recorder

of facts. In making these ideas the guiding-lines of his history, he gives his work a unity of which it would otherwise have been devoid. He reproduces the past in the present, combining the sublimity which is the characteristic of the former with the liveliness which is peculiar to the latter. In order to do this, he must call into action those powers which are peculiar to the poet and the philosopher respectively, in addition to those especially vouchsafed to the historian. He must be a theoretical as well as a practical man — a great student of books and at the same time a fine observer of life. Nothing human should escape his notice. The busy life of the politician, the highest flights of the poet, and the profoundest speculations of the philosopher, should all be familiar to him. Hence he should possess the highest mental capacities, and be acquainted with the human mind in all its varieted forms. How intensely important must then be his own life, how carefully must he observe his own history. His is, indeed, a bold and delicate task, — to discover in the complicated course of human affairs the eternal plans of divine providence. These invisibly accompany the occurrences and the phenomena of the external world, and reduce its apparently chaotic masses into form and order, as well as penetrate and fashion all human history. With these remarks we close our Introduction, hoping that the obscurity resting over a part of the records of this period, may soon be dispelled, and that the inquiring spirit of the times directing its attention to the difficulties these present, may effect a speedy and a satisfactory solution.

History of the Conquest of Andalus.

*He says**). Musa Ibn Nosseyr sent his son Merwan to Tangiers, to wage a holy war upon her coast. Having, then, exerted himself together with his friends, he returned, leaving to Tarik Ibn Amru the command of his army which amounted to 1,700. Others say that 12,000 Berbers besides 16 Arabs were with Tarik: but that is false. It is also said that Musa Ibn Nosseyr marched out of Ifrikiya upon an expedition into Tangiers, and that he was the first governor who entered Tangiers, where parts of the Berber tribes Botr and Beranes resided. These had not yet submitted themselves. When he approached Tangiers, he scattered his light troops. On the arrival of his cavalry in the nearest province of Sus, he subdued its inhabitants, and made them prisoners; they yielding him obedience. And he gave them a governor whose conduct was agreeable to them. He sent Ibn Beshr Ibn Abi Artah to a citadel, three days' journey from the town of Cairwan. Having taken the former, he made prisoners of the children, and plundered the treasury. The citadel was called Beshr, by which name it is known to this day. Afterwards Musa deposed the viceroy whom he had placed over Tangiers, and appointed Tarik Ibn Zeiyad governor. He, then, returned to Cairwan, Tarik with his female slave of the name of Umm-Hakim setting out for Tangiers. Tarik remained some time in this district, waging a holy war. This was in the year 92. The governor of the straits between this district and Andalus, was a foreigner called Ilyan, Lord of Septa. He was also the governor of a town called Alchadra,

---

*) *He says* at the commencement of a new period always refers to the chief narrator in this history.

situated on the same side of the straits of Andalus as Tangiers. Ilyan was a subject of Roderic the Lord of Andalus, who used to reside in Toledo. Tarik put himself in communication with Ilyan, and treated him kindly, until they made peace with each other. Ilyan had sent one of his daughters to Roderic, the Lord of Andalus, for her improvement and education; but she became pregnant by him. Ilyan having heard of this, said, I see for him no other punishment or recompense, than that I should bring the Arabs against him. He sent to Tarik, saying, I will bring thee to Andalus; Tarik being at that time in Tlemsen, and Musa Ibn Nosseyr in Cairwan. But Tarik said I cannot trust thee until thou send me a hostage. So, he sent his two daughters, having no other children. Tarik allowed them to remain in Tlemsen, guarding them closely. After that Tarik went to Ilyan who was in Septa on the straits. The latter rejoicing at his coming, said, I will bring thee to Andalus. But there was a mountain called the mountain of Tarik between the two landing places, that is, between Septa and Andalus. When the evening came, Ilyan brought him the vessels, in which he made him embark for that landing-place, where he concealed himself during the day, and in the evening sent back the vessels to bring over the rest of his companions. So they embarked for the landing-place, none of them being left behind: whereas the people of Andalus did not observe them, thinking that the vessels crossing and recrossing were similar to the trading vessels which for their benefit plied backwards and forwards. Tarik was in the last division which went across. He proceeded to his companions, Ilyan together with the merchants that were with him being left behind in Alchadra, in order that he might the better encourage his companions and countrymen. The news of Tarik and of those who were with him, as well as of the place where they were, reached the people of Andalus. Tarik going along with his companions, marched over a bridge of mountains to a town called Cartagena. He went in the direction of Cordova. Having passed by an island in the sea, he left behind his female slave of the name of Umm-Hakim, and with her a devision of his troops. That island was then called Umm-Hakim. When the Moslems

settled in the island, they found no other inhabitants there, than vinedressers. They made them prisoners. After that they took one of the vinedressers, slaughtered him, cut him in pieces, and boiled him, while the rest of his companions looked on. They had also boiled meat in other cauldrons. When the meat was cooked, they threw away the flesh of that man which they had boiled; no one knowing that it was thrown away: and they ate the meat which they had boiled, while the rest of the vinedressers were spectators These did not doubt but that the Moslems ate the flesh of their companion; the rest being afterwards sent away, informed the people of Andalus that the Moslems feed on human flesh, acquainting them with what had been done to the vinedresser.

As Abd-Errahman has related to us on the authority of his father Abd-Allah Ibn Abd-El-Hakem, and of Hisham Ibn Ishaak: There was a house in Andalus, the door of which was secured with padlocks, and on which every new king of the country placed a padlock of his own, until the accession to power of the king against whom the Moslems marched. They therefore begged him to place a padlock on it, as the kings before him were wont to do. But he refused saying, I will place nothing on it, until I shall have known what is inside; he then ordered it to be opened; but behold inside were portraits of the Arabs, and a letter in which it was written: „when this door shall be opened, these people will invade this country."

Afterwards he returns to the traditions of Othman and of others. *He says.* When Tarik landed, soldiers from Cordova came to meet him; and seeing the small number of his companions they despised him on that account. They then fought. The battle with Tarik was severe. They were routed, and he did not cease from the slaughter of them till they reached the town of Cordova. When Roderic heard of this, he came to their rescue from Toledo. They then fought in a place of the name of Shedunia, in a valley which is called this day the valley of Umm-Hakim. They fought a severe batttle: but God, mighty and great, killed Roderic and his companions. Mugheyth Errumi, a slave of Welid, was then the commander of Tarik's cavalry. Mugheyth Errumi went in the direction of Cordova, Tarik passing over

to Toledo. He, then, entered it, and asked for the table, having nothing else to occupy himself. This, as the men of the Bible relate, was the table of Suleyman Ibn Dawid, may the blessing of God be upon him.

As Abd Errahman has related to us on the authority of Yahya Ibn Bukeir, and the latter on the authority of Leyth Ibn Sâd: Andalus having been conquered for Musa Ibn Nosseyr, he took from it the table of Suleyman Ibn Dawid, and the crown. Tarik was told that the table was in a citadel called Faras, two days' journey from Toledo, and that the governor of this citadel was a nephew of Roderic. Tarik, then, wrote to him, promising safety both for himself and family. The nephew descended from the citadel, and Tarik fulfilled his promise with reference to his safety. Tarik said to him, deliver the table, and he delivered it to him. On this table were gold and silver, the like of which one had not seen. Tarik, then, took off one of its legs together with the pearls and the gold it contained, and fixed to it a similar leg. The table was valued at two hundred thousand dinars, on account of the pearls that were on it. He took up the pearls, the armour, the gold, the silver, and the vases which he had with him, and found that quantity of spoils, the like of which one had not seen. He collected all that. Afterwards he returned to Cordova, and having stopped there, he wrote to Musa Ibn Nosseyr informing him of the conquest of Andalus, and of the spoils which he had found. Musa then wrote to Welid Ibn Abd El-Malik informing him of that, and throwing himself upon his mercy. Musa wrote to Tarik ordering him not to leave Cordova until he should come to him. And he reprimanded him very severely. Afterwards Musa Ibn Nosseyr set out for Andalus, in Rajab of the year 93, taking with him the chiefs of the Arabs, the commanders, and the leaders of the Berbers to Andalus. He set out being angry with Tarik, and took with him Habib Ibn Abi Ubcida Elfihri, and left the government of Cairwan to his son Abd Allah who was his eldest son. He then passed through Alchadra, and afterwards went over to Cordova. Tarik then met him, and tried to satisfy him, saying: „I am merely thy slave, this conquest is thine.“ Musa

collected of the money a sum, which exceeded all description. Tarik delivered to him all that he had plundered.

He says. It is said by others, Roderic marched against Tarik, while the latter was on the mountain. When he came up to him, Tarik marched out against him; Roderic being at that time seated on his royal throne borne by two mules; and wearing a crown, decorations for the head and feet, and all the ornaments which the kings before him were accustomed to wear. Tarik and his companions marched out against him, all being on foot, no rider being among them. So they fought from sunrise till sunset, and they thought their destruction involved; but God killed Roderic and his companions, and gave the Moslems the victory. And there was never in the West a more bloody battle than this. The Moslems did not withdraw their swords from Roderic and his companions for three days. The soldiers returned afterwards to Cardova.

He says. It is also said, that it was Musa, after his arrival in Andalus, who sent Tarik to Toledo. This town lies between Cordova and Narbonne; and Narbonne determines the boundary of Andalus. The command of Omar Ibn Abd-Elaziz reached to Narbonne, which the Christians afterwards conquered, and it is in their hands this day. It is also said, that Tarik merely found the table there; but God knows. Roderic had possessed two thousand miles and more of the coast. The soldiers found a large booty of gold and silver. As Abd-Errahman, on the authority of Abd-El-Malik Ibn Mohammed, and the latter on the authority of El-Leyth Ibn Sâd, say: If this was so, perhaps it relates to the carpet that was found, interwoven with gold twigs, ornamented with a row of gold strings, pearls, hya cinths, and emeralds. The Berbers had often found it, but could not lift it up till they brought a hatchet. Having then cut it in the middle, one of them took one half, the other took the remainder: while a crowd followed them, the soldiers being engaged with another matter.

As Abd-Errahman on the authority of Abd-Elmalik, and the latter on the authority of Leyth Ibn Sâd, say: When Andalus was conquered, a man came to Musa Ibn Nosseyr and said, send with me, I will show you a treasure. He, then, sent

persons with him. The man said to them, dig here; so they dug, and there flowed upon them emeralds, and hyacinths, the like of which they had never seen. When they saw this, they were afraid, saying, Musa will not believe us, so they sent to him repeatedly till he came, and looked at it.

As Abd-Errahman, on the authority of Abd El-Malik Ibn Mohammed, and the latter on the authority of Leyth Ibn Sâd. say: Musa Ibn Nosseyr, after he had conquered Andalus, wrote to Abd-Allah, saying, that it was not a conquest, but the judgment-day.

As Abd-Errahman; on the authority of Abd-El-Malik Ibn Mohammed, and the latter on the authority of Malik Ibn Anas, and Malik Ibn Anas on the authority of Yahya Ibn Sâd, say: »When Andalus was conquered, the soldiers found plunder there. Having unjustly taken a large quantity of spoils, they placed them on board of the ships, and set sail. When they were in the middle of the sea, they heard a voice, crying, O God, drown them! They, then, called to God, and hung about them copies of the Koran like ornaments. Suddenly violent wind overtook them, and made the ships strike one against the other, so that they were wrecked, and the men drowned. But the people of Egypt deny this, saying, it was not the people of Andalus who were drowned, but only the people of Sardinia. This is asserted, as Abd-Errahman on the authority of Sa'id Ibn Gafeir, says, because the people of Sardinia made use of their port, when the Moslems advanced towards them. And having closed it up, the latter let the water out. Then having thrown gold and silver vases into it, they let the water return into its natural course. And they made use of one their churches; having placed an additional roof on it, they placed their money between the two roofs. But one of the Moslems went down to bathe in the port which they had closed up, and into which they had afterwards let the water return. The man stumbled against something, and he brought it out, and behold it was a silver plate. Afterwards he dived in again, and brought another thing out. When the Moslems saw that, they kept him away from the water, and took up all those vases. One of the Moslems with bow and arrow entered that church, between the roofs

of which they had placed their money. He looked at some doves, and took aim at them with an arrow, but missed them, hitting a log of wood, and splitting it, and money flowed upon them. The Moslems then made a large quantity of booty. But if this was so, perhaps it relates to the man, who found the cat and killed her, throwing out what was in the belly. Afterwards he stuffed her with the booty he had acquired; he, then, sewed her up, and threw her into the road; so that whoever should see her, might think, it was a corpse; but when he went away, he took her up. Or it refers perhaps to the man who removed the point of his sword, and threw it away, and filled the sheath with plunder; placing the hilt of the sword on the sheath. When they went aboard the ships, and set sail, they heard a voice, crying, O God, drown them! they, then, placed about themselves as ornaments copies of the Koran; but they were all drowned, except Abu Abd Errahman Elhobli, and Hansh Ibn Abd Allah Essanai; both of whom had nothing to do with the rapine.

As Abd Errahman, on the authority of Abd-Elmalik Ibn Mohammed, and the latter on the authority of Ibn Luhaia, say: I heard Abu Aswad, I heard Amru Ibn Aus say, Musa Ibn Nosseyr sent me, that I might examine the companions of Ata Ibn Rafia, freedman of Ibn Hudeil. When the ships were wrecked, I often found that a man had concealed the dinars with a ragged part of his garment, in a something between his privy parts. He says, a man leaning on his staff passed by me, I, then, went up to him that I might examine him; he quarrelled with me, so I was angry, and took the staff, and struck him with it; so it broke, then the dinars dropped from him, and I took them all up.

As Abd Errahman, on the authority of Abd-El-Malik, and the latter on the authority of El-Leyth Ibn Said, say: I heard that a man, in the expedition of Ata and others in the West, committed a robbery, so he went away with the plunder, and laid it down in pitch; then in the moment of death he was crying, beware of the pitch, of the pitch.

He says. Musa Ibn Nosseyr seized Tarik Ibn Amru, bound him with fetters, imprisoned him, and thought of putting him

to death. Mugheyth Errumi being a slave o Welid Ibn Elmalik, Tarik wrote to him, saying, if thou wilt bring my case before Welid, and say, that Andalus was conquered by my hands, and that Musa has imprisoned me, and that he wishes to put me to death, I will give thee hundred slaves: and he made him swear to that condition. When Mugheyth wished to depart, he took leave of Musa Ibn Nosseyr, telling him, act not in a hurry against Tarik; thou hast enemies, and the Commander of the Faithful has already heard of his case; and I am afraid of his anger against thee. Mugheyth, then, departed, while Musa was in Andalus. When Mugheyth appeared before Welid, he informed him of the part which Tarik had taken in the conquest of Andalus, and of his being imprisoned by Musa, who also wished some means of putting him to death. Welid, then, wrote to Musa, swearing to him by God, if thou strike him, I will strike thee, if thou kill him, I will kill thy son for him; and he sent the letter by Mugheyth Errumi, who brought it to Musa in Andalus. When the latter read it, he released Tarik, and let him go his way. Tarik fulfilled his promise with Mugheyth in regard to the hundred slaves, which he had proposed to him. Musa Ibn Nosseyr marched out of Andalus, with his spoils, the pearls, and the table, leaving the government of Andalus to his son Abd Elaziz. Musa's stay in Andalus was in the year 93, 94, and a month of the year 95. When Musa arrived in Ifrikiya, Welid Ibn Abd Elmalik wrote him, to come to him. He set out, leaving the government of Ifrikiya to his son Abd Allah. Musa marched with those spoils and presents until he came to Egypt, and Welid Ibn Abd Elmalik was ill. In the meantime, the latter wrote to Musa repeatedly, saying, he should hurry himself, and Suleyman wrote ordering him to delay, that Welid having died in the interval, what Musa had along with him might fall to his lot: but Musa marched until he came to Tiberias, where the news of the death of Welid reached him. He then brought the presents to Suleyman, who was proud of them. It is also said that Musa Ibn Nosseyr, as he came from Andalus, did not stop in Cairwan, but passed by it, stopping in a palace on the water. Thence he started early; and marched taking Tarik along with him.

As Abd Irrahman, on the authority of Yahya Ibn Bukeir and the latter, following Elleyth Ibn Sâd, say: Musa Ibn Nosseyr came with a large retinue, and appeared before the Commander of the Faithful in the year 96, entering Fastat on Thursday six nights before the end of Rabia the first.

Afterwards he returns to the traditions of Othman and others. *He says.* When Suleyman received those presents, one of the people of Medina, and of the companions of Musa, who was set over the booty, and called Isa Ibn Abd Allah, „the long," stepped forward, and said; O Prince of the Faithful! God has richly bestowed upon thee lawful spoils; so that thou canst dispense with forbidden ones. I am the manager of this booty; surely Musa has not produced all that he brought with him. Suleyman being angry, rose from his throne, and entered his house; afterwards he came out to the people, and said, yes, God has richly bestowed upon me lawful spoils, so that I can dispense with forbidden ones; and he gave orders to take them into the treasury house of the Moslems, having already ordered Musa Ibn Nosseyr to indicate his wants and those of his companions, and to depart to the West.

He says. It is said by others, that Musa Ibn Nosseyr came to Welid Ibn Abd-El-Malik, while the latter was ill. Musa then gave him the table; but Tarik said, it was I that found it. Upon which Musa gave him the lie. Tarik then said to Welid, call for the table, and see, if it has any defect. Welid called for it and looked; and behold one of its legs did not correspond to the rest. Tarik said, question him O Commander of the Faithful, and if thou find in his account of the matter a proof of his being right, then he is right. So Welid questioned him about the table; the latter said, so have I found it. But Tarik produced the leg, which he had taken off, on finding the table, and said, may the Commander of the Faithful find therein a proof of the truth of what I told him, and that it was I who found the table. Welid, then believed him, took his word, and valued his present.

Afterwards he returns to the traditions of Othman and others. *He says.* Abd-Elaziz Ibn Musa, after the departure of his father, had married a Christian lady, a daughter of a king

of Andalus called Roderic, whom Tarik killed. She brought him a large fortune which exceeded all description. When she came to him, she said, why do I not see the people of thy kingdom respect thee and bow to thee, as my father's subjects were wont to respect him and bow to him. Not knowing what to reply to her, he gave orders for a small door to he made in a side of his palace. He used to give audience to the people, and any one visiting him entered through the door, bowing his head on account of the door being small; while she was on the spot observing the people entering. When she saw this, she said to Abd-Elaziz, my people are now truly thy possession. The people heard, that he had made the door only for that purpose; and some conjectured that she had made him a Christian. There rebelled against him Habib Ibn Abi Obeida Elfihri, and Zeiyad Ibn En-nabighah Et-temimi, and some companions of theirs of the Arab tribes. And they resolved upon killing Abd-Elaziz, of whose case they had heard. They then went to his Muadsin and said to him, pronounce the hour for public prayer in the night, that we may come out to prayers. Muadsin did so, and said repeatedly, it is better to pray than to sleep. Abd-Elaziz then came out, and said, Muadsin! thou hast hurried thyself, by calling to prayers in the night. Afterwards he went into the Mosque, where those persons were assembled, and others who were present for prayers. Abd-Elaziz came forward, and began to read (in the Koran*) „*when the resurrection comes, there is no denying of it, it humiliates, it elevates.*“ Habib, then, lifted up his sword against the head of Abd-Elazaz; but the latter escaped by running, until he came into his house; then, having entered one of his gardens, he concealed himself there under a tree. Habib Ibn Obeida and his companions fled; but Zeiyad Ibn En-nabighah followed Abd-Elaziz, and having entered upon his track, found him under the tree. Abd-Elaziz then said to him, O Ibn En-nabighah! spare me, and thine is all thou ask for: but he replied, thou shalt not taste of life after this. Having rushed upon him, he cut off his head; Habib and his companions having heard of this, re-

*) Sur 56: 1—3.

turned. Afterwards they set out with the head of Abd-Elaziz to Suleyman Ibn Abd El-Malik; and they appointed Aiyub, a nephew of Musa Ibn Nosseyr governor of Andalus. They passed by Cairwan, the governor of which city being Abd-Allah Ibn Musa Ibn Nosseyr; but he did not meet them: and they marched on till they came with the head of Abd-Elaziz Ibn Musa to Suleyman. They placed it in his hands, in the presence of Musa Ibn Nosseyr; Suleyman asked the latter, dost thou know this; he replied, I know him to be a man who fasted and prayed; and may the curse of God be upon him, if his murderer is a better man than he. Abd-Elaziz was killed in the year 97. Abd-Errahman, on the authority of Yahya Ibn Abd-Allah Ibn Bukeir, and the latter on the authority of El-Leyth Ibn Sâd, say: Suleyman being angry with Musa Ibn Nosseyr, delivered him to Habib Ibn Abi Obeida and his companions, in order to take him out to Ifrikiya; but he implored the assistance of Aiyub Ibn Suleyman, who protected him, and interceded for him with his father. It is also said, that Suleyman imprisoned Musa Ibn Nosseyr, and fined him of a hundred thousand dinars, putting that sum down to his charge, and taking all from him; but the latter implored the aid of Yezid Ibn Muhallab who asked Suleyman to give Musa up to him; so he gave him up to him, as well as his money, and that he returned to him not charging him with anything. The people of Andalus remained two years after this without a governor appointed by the Khalif. Suleyman intending to make the pilgrimage, let Musa Ibn Nosseyr march out with the view of keeping him by him. So he (Musa) marched out until he came to El-Merbed where he died: and his death was in the year 97, as Abd-Errahman, on the authority of Yahya Ibn Bukeir, and the latter on the authority of El-Leyth Ibn Sàd, say.

Afterwards Mohammed Ibn Yezid El-Koraishi was appointed governor of Ifrikiya; Soleyman Ibn Abd El-Malik making him governor on the advice of Raja Ibn Haiyat, and deposing Abd-Allah Ibn Musa, in the year 96. Abd-Errahman, on the authority of Ibn Bukeir, and the latter on the authority of El-Leyth Ibn Sàd, say: Mohammed Ibn Yezid was made governor of Ifrikiya in the year 97. Mohammed Ibn Yezid did not cease

to be a governor until Suleyman Ibn Abd El-Malik died: and his death was on Friday ten nights before the end of Safar of the year 99. He was then deposed, and Isma'il Ibn Abd-Allah in Moharram of the year 100, was made in his stead a governor of the war, of the imposts, and of the taxes. And his conduct was agreeable to them; so that there remained in his provinces not a single Berber at that time, who did not become Moslem: and he continued to govern the country until Omar Ibn Abd-Elaziz died. His death was on Friday ten nights before the end of Rajab of the year 101, as And-Errahman, on the authority of Ibn Bukeir and the latter on the authority of Leyth Ibn Sâd say. He was then deposed, and Yezid Ibn Abi Moslem secretary of El-Hajjaj was made governor in his stead, Yezid Ibn Abd-El-Malik giving him that appointment in the year 101. Abd-Allah Ibn Musa Ibn Nosseyr was then in the East; and he came along with Yezid Ibn Abi Moslem to Ifrikiya. As he (Abd-Allah) approached it, the people came out to meet him. On entering Cairwan, Yezid Ibn Abi Moslem bade Abd-Allah Ibn Musa Ibn Nosseyr return to his mansion; Abd Allah then went to his house, and Yezid bade the people follow him; so that they believed that he was his friend. After Abd-Allah had retired, Yezid let a messenger follow him, saying, count from thy money a sufficient sum to pay the soldiers for five years. Afterwards Yezid Ibn Abi Moslem seized the Berber freedmen of Musa Ibn Nosseyr, branded their two hands, and appropriated the fifth part of their goods, and reckoned their money and children. He then made them his body-guards and his friends: and he imprisoned Mohammed Ibn Yezid El-Koraishi, then punished him marking his skin, producing pain. The latter asked him for water, Yezid gave him water mixed with ashes. Mohammed Ibn Yezid had been commanded, in the time of Hajjaj, to punish Yezid Ibn Abi Moslem in the East. Yezid said to him, if I get up to-morrow morning, I will punish thee till thou diest, or I die before thee. And he had built for him in prison a narrow cell, he, then, placed him in it, clothing him in a coarse woollen tunic which he sealed with a leaden seal. When Yezid Ibn Abi Moslem was supping, grapes among other eatables were brought in to

him; and as he was taking a bunch of them, one of his body guards called Jarir rushing on him with his sword, struck him dead. Having cut off his head he threw it in the evening into the Mosque. A slave of Mohammed Ibn Yezid went to him in prison aud said, rejoice, for Yezid is killed. Mohammed thinking, that he was imposing upon him, said, thou art a liar. Afterwards another of the slaves followed him, and then another, till seven came. When Mohammed knew for certain that Yezid was dead, he set the slaves at liberty.

He says. It is said by others, the body-guards of Yezid Ibn Abi Moslem when he came to Ifrikiya, were Berbers; among whom there were none except those of the tribe Botr. And they were the body-guards of the governors before him — the tribe Botr were the life-guards, among whom there was not a single one of the tribe Beranes. Yezid Ibn Abi Moslem addressed the soldiers from the pulpit, saying, if I am a devout man, I will brand my body-guards on their hands, as the Greeks were wont to do. He, then, marked on the right hand of each one his name, and on the left „my body-guards;“ so that they were by that mark distinguished from others. They were enraged at this, and they consulted together about putting him to death. He went out in the night to the Mosque for evening prayer: and they killed him in his sacred habiliments. He was killed in the year 102. As Abd-Errahman, on the authority of Yahya Ibn Bukeir, and the latter on the authority of Leyth Ibn Sâd say.

When Yezid Ibn Abi Moslem was killed, the people assembled, and looked out for a man to govern them until the opinion of Yezid Ibn Abd-El-Malik should be known. They elected El-Mugheira Ibn Abi Burdah El-Koraishi, afterwards one of the sons of Abd Dâr. But his son Abd-Allah said to him, O sir! this man is killed in thy presence, therefore, if thou stand at the head of the government after him, I am afraid that the Commander of the Faithful will charge thee with his murder; so the old man took this advice. The people of Ifrikiya were then unamimous for Mohammed Ibn Aus El-Ansari, who was in Tunis at the head of an expedition into her district. Having sent to him they made him their governor: and he wrote to

Yezid informing him of what happened, and sent as his messenger on this subject Chalid Ibn Abi Omran, who was one of the people of Tunis. Tha latter, [then, came to Yezid and was received by him, and pardoned for the part he had taken in their guilt. Chalid Ibn Abi Omran said, Yezid invited me privately, and asked, what sort of a man is Mohammed Ibn Aus; I replied, he is a religious and an excellent man, and versed in legal and divine things. He said, was there not in it (Ifrikiya) a Koraishi, I answered yes, El-Mugeira Ibn Abi Burdah. I know him, said he, why did he not remain, to which I replied, because he did not like to do so, and loved to be free from office. He was then silent. The people suspected Abd-Allah Ibn Musa Ibn Nosseyr, that it was he who caused the murder of Yezid Ibn Abi Moslem.

Yezid Ibn Abd El-Malik, then, sent to Ifrikiya Beshr Ibn Safwan El-Kelbi, who was his viceroy in Egypt. This was in the year 102. He, then, set out for Ifrikiya, leaving the government of Egypt to his brother Han'tala. When be entered Ifrikiya, he heard that it was Abd-Allah Ibn Musa who secretly instigated the murder of Yezid Ibn Abi Moslem; Chalid Ibn Abi Habib El-Koraishi and others bearing witness to this. Beshr wrote to Yezid Ibn Abd El-Malik, and the latter replied ordering him to put Abd Allah Ibn Musa Ibn Nosseyr to death. Beshr thought of delaying him a few days; but Chalid Ibn Habib, and Mohammed Ibn Abi Bukeir said to Beshr Ibn Safwan, hasten to put him to death before his pardon shall have arrived from the Commander of the Faithful. The mother of Abd-Allah Ibn Musa Ibn Nosseyr was the wife of Rabia the lord of the privy-seal of Yezid. Rabia spoke to Yezid, and the latter ordered Abd-Allah's pardon, upon this his sister offered the messenger three thousand dinars if he should go up to her brother [with this news]. Beshr ordered Abd-Allah Ibn Musa to be put to death; and he was killed; the messenger arriving with his pardon on the same day on which he was murdered. Beshr send his head with Suleyman Ibn Wagalah Et-tamimi to Yezid, who then hung it up. Afterwards Beshr Ibn Safwan went to Yezid with presents which he had prepared for him; as he was on the road thither, the news of Yezid's death rea-

ched him. His death was on Friday night four nights before the end of Shaban of the year 105: as Abd-Errahman, on the authority of Yahya Ibn Bukeir, and the latter on the authority of Leyth Ibn Sâd say. Beshr came with those gifts to Hisham Ibn Abd El-Malik, who made him return to Ifrikiya. Having arrived there, he searched for the money of Musa Ibn Nosseyr, and punished his viceroys; and made 'Anbasa Ibn Soheym El-Kelbi governor of Andalus, having first removed from it El-horr Ibn Abd-Errahman El-Absi. Beshr made an expedition into the sea of Ifrikiya; but the storm overtook them (the crew), and a great number of his army perished owing to this. Afterwards Beshr Ibn Safwan died of a disease called „*Elwabita*" in Shawwal of the year 109.

Abd Errahman, on the authority of Yahya Ibn Bukeir and the latter on the authority of Leyth Ibn Sâd say: Beshr Ibn Safwan came down to Ifrikiya in the year 105, and was sent to it the second time in the year 106, and died in the year 109. Beshr Ibn Safwan left on his death the government of Ifrikiya to Ba'as Ibn Karat El-Kelbi; but Hisham deposed him and appointed Ubeida Ibn Abd-Errahman El-Keisi governor of Ifrikiya. Abd-Errahman, on the authority of Yahya Ibn Abd-Allah Ibn Bukeir, and the latter on the authority of Leyth Ibn Sâd say: Ubeida Ibn Abd-Errahman was made governor of Ifrikiya in Moharram of the year 110. When Ubeida arrived in that country, he sent El-mustanir Ibn El-harith El-horaishi on an expedion against Sicily; but a storm overtook them (the crew) and plunged them into the sea. And the vessel in which El-mustanir was, was wrecked against the coast of Tripolis. Ubeida Ibn Abd-Errahman wrote to Yezid Ibn Abi Moslem his viceroy in Tripolis, ordering him to bind El-mustanir with fetters, and to send a trustworthy man along with him: so he sent him away in fetters. When the latter came to Ubeida he marked his skin, producing pain; and led him round Cairwan on an ass. Afterwards he began to beat him once every week until he could no longer suffer it. That was done, because El-mustanir stopped in the land of the Greeks until the winter had set in, and the waves of the sea and its storms had become violent; and

he did not cease to be his prisoner. Ubeida had made Abd-Errahman Ibn Abd Allah Elakki governor of Andalus, and he was a good man; and made an expedition into France, the inhabitants of which country were the enemies the most remote from Andalus; and having conquered them, he made large spoils, among which he found a leg of gold adorned with pearls, hyacinths, and emeralds. He then gave orders to break it; after that he set aside the fifth part, and divided the remainder between the Moslems who were with him. Ubeida on hearing that, became exceedingly incensed, and wrote Abd Errahman a letter in which he threatened him; the latter replied, saying; „*were the heavens and the earth a chaos, the Merciful would effect a deliverance to the pious out of them*"*). He afterwards marched out on an expedition against them (French) a second time; and died as a martyr together with all his companions. He was killed in the year 115: as Abd Errahman, on the authority of Yahya Ibn Bukeir, the latter on the authority of El-leyth Ibn Sâd, say. After him Ubeida made Abd El-malik Ibn Katan governor of Andalus, and then marched out to Hisham Ibn Abd El-malik, bringing presents with him. This was in the month Ramadhan of the year 114.

It is said by Abd Errahman, on the authority of Yahya Ibn Bukeir, the latter on the authority of El-leyth Ibn Sâd; that the departure from Ifrikiya of Ubeida Ibn Abd El-malik was in the year 115, in which year he appointed Ibn Katan governor of Andalus. He brought with him, among other things, male and female slaves, and seven hundred of the best girls, besides eunuchs, horses, medicine, gold, silver, and vases. He left on his departure the government of Ifrikiya to Okba Ibn Kudama Et-tajibi. He then came to Hisham with his presents, and asked him for leave of absence, and he gave him leave of absence, and wrote to Ubeid Allah Ibn El-Habhab who was his viceroy in Egypt, ordering him to go to Ifrikiya, of which country he made him governor. This was in month Rabia the second of the year 116. Ubeid Allah Ibn El-Habhab came to

*) Sur. 21: 31. 65: 2.

Ifrikiya, and took El-mustanir out of prison, and made him governor of Tunis; he made his son Isma'il Ibn Abd Allah viceroy of Sus, and appointed his son Kasim Ibn Abd Allah ruler of Egypt; he made Okba Ibn El-Hajjaj regent of Andalus, having first deposed Abd El-malik Ibn Katan. It is said by others, that the governor of Andalus at that time, was Anbasa Ibn Soheym El-kelbi, whom Ibn El-Habhab deposed, appointing Okba Ibn El-Hajjaj governor; but the latter perished in Andalus. Ubeid Allah, then, made Ibn Abd El-malik Ibn Katan governor of the country for the second time. Abd Allah Ibn Habib Ibn Abi Ubeida El-fihri made an expedition into Sus and into the country of Sudan; he obtained a victory over the inhabitants, the like of which had not been seen; he found as much gold as he wanted, and among other spoils, he found a girl or two of a race which the Berbers call Ujan, and of which, all the girls have but one teat. He afterwards made again an expedition which was upon the sea; he then returned, and the Berbers broke the treaty with Ubeid Allah Ibn El-Habhab in Tangiers, and killed his viceroy Omar Ibn Abd Allah Elmoradi; and the man who brought this about was Meisara El-fakir, the Berber, afterwards one of the tribe Badghar, who was the ruler of the Berbers; and he caused himself to be called Khalif, deriving a title from that office, and receiving a homage thereupon. Meisara then made Abd Allah Ibn Hodeidj El-Ifriki governor of Tangiers; he was originally a Greek, a freedman of Ibn Nosseyr. He afterwards went to Sus, the governor of which was Isma'il Ibn Ubeid Allah, and he killed him; and that was the first insurrection of the Berbers in Ifrikiya. Ubeid Allah Ibn El-Habhab sent Chalid Ibn El-Habib Elfihri against the Berbers in Tangiers, and with him he sent the chiefs of the people of Ifrikiya; from Koraish, Alanzar, and other tribes. But Chalid and his companions were killed, none of them having escaped: that was, then, called the expedition of the nobles.

It is also said, that Chalid met Meisara near Tangiers. The latter, then, killed him and those who were with him. Meisara afterwards returned to Tangiers; but the Berbers objected to his usual mode of living, and to a change of the conditions

of their homage to him. They, then, put him to death, and appointed Abd El-malik Ibn Katan El-mohari their governor.

Abd Errahman, on the authority of Yahya Ibn Bukeir, the latter on the authority of El-leyth Ibn Sad, say: the quarrel of Meisara and the inhabitants of Ifrikiya with the Berbers, and the murder of Isma'il Ibn Abd Allah, and Chalid Ibn Abi Habib were in the year 123. Ibn El-Habhab then sent against the Berbers Habib Ibn Abi Ubeida. When the latter reached Tlemsen, he imprisoned Musa Ibn Abi Chalid, who was the governor of Tlemsen and freedman of Muawia Ibn Hodeidj. There had assembled around him those who were his subjects. Habib suspected that Musa would act with passion towards him, or that he had been privately instigated to the insurrection; so he cut off his hand and his leg: he then remained in Tlemsen together with his army.

Ubeid Allah Ibn El-Habhab went with a large retinue to Hisham Ibn Abd El-malik. That was in Jumada the first of the year 123. Hisham afterwards sent to Ifrikiya Kolthum Ibn Iyadh El-Keisi, in Jumada the second of the year 123. And Balj Ibn Beshr went before him. After Kolthum had arrived in Ifrikiya, he ordered the inhabitants to wage war, and to march out with him against the Berbers. And he imposed upon the people of Tripolis the duty of raising an army. He then set out with a large number, leaving Abd Errahman Ibn Okba Elghifari as governor of Cairwan, and Maslama Ibn Sawada El-koraishi as commander-in-chief of the war. Ukasha Ibn Aiyub Elfazari from the district Cabis rebelled against him, after the departure of Kolthum who would go to Tangiers. Ukasha was a Sofariy, and he sent a brother of his, who then went to Sabra where he assembled the Zenata: and the people of Suk Sabra were present in their Mosque; their governor being Habib Ibn Maimun. And the news reached Safwan Ibn Abi Malik who was governor of Tripolis. He, then, marched out with them, and attacked the brother of Elfazari, who was besieging the people of Sabra. He afterwards gave them battle, and Elfazari fled, and his companions of the Zenata and of the other tribes were put to death: and he escaped to his brother in Cabis.

Maslama Ibn Sawada marched out with the people of Cairwan against Ukasha Ibn Aiyub in Cabis. The latter then gave them battle, and Maslama was put to flight and a great number of those who marched out with him were killed: Maslama stopped in Cairwan, and the greatest part of the people of that city who accompanied him, defended themselves; their governor being Saad Ibn Bahira Elghassani.

It is said by others, that Kolthum Ibn Iyadh, as he came from Hisham, passed by Cairwan; neither having stopped in it, nor entered it; but staid in Sebiba, which town is a day's journey from Cairwan: and having stopped there during the month Shawwal, he wrote to Habib Ibn Abi Ubeida, not to disband the army until he should come to him. Kolthum afterwards set out on an expedition which was continued until he came to Habib. The two then together with their companions entered Tangiers the same time. Kolthum, when he marched out against the Berbers, had appointed Balj Ibn Beshr the general of the advanced troops. When he came to Habib, he reprimanded him, and despised his authority. Kolthum then came forward, and having met Habib, he also treated him with contumely. Kolthum then addressed the soldiers from the pulpit on the conspiracy which had been detected by him. So he reprimanded Habib, and despised him and his family; while Abd Errahman Ibn Habib was present with his father Habib. Kolthum then advanced, and when he had obtained what he wanted from the province of Tangiers, there met him a crowd of Berbers, the governor of whom being Chalid Ibn Humeid Ezzenati, afterwards Elhutouri: they were naked and light-armed, none of them having anything on except trowsers; they were Sofariy, and came up separately. Habib Ibn Abi Ubeida then advised Kolthum to let the infantry contend with the infantry, and the cavalry with the cavalry. Kolthum replied, we have no need of thy opinion, O Ibn Habib! and he sent Balj Ibn Beshr against the cavalry in order to subdue them. Kolthum had more confidence in the cavalry than in the infantry. Balj travelled through the night, so that he attacked them at the dawn; and they came up to him naked and light-armed. The cavalry attacked them, and they shouted, and retreated,

and threw their slings. Balj being wounded, was put to flight, and the cavalries attacked Kolthum who had prepared himself, and put his companions in battle array. He, then, sent to Habib Ibn Abi Ubeida, saying, the Prince of the Faithful has ordered me to make thee a commander-in-chief of the battle, and to give thee the authority over the soldiers. Habib replied, it is now too late; and the infantry of the Berbers are gone on the track of the cavalry [which they followed] until they attacked Kolthum and his companions. Habib then conjured his son Abd-Errahman not to go on foot, but to adhere to Balj; urging him to share in his resentment against the latter; adding, „I shall be killed.“ Kolthum, Habib, and their companions perished, and the soldiers fled to Ifrikiya. Kolthum was killed in the year 123.

Abd-Errahman, on the authority of Yahya Ibn Bukeir, the 7
latter on the authority of El-leyth Ibn Sad, say: Kolthum was killed in the year 124. Meisara killed him. Balj Ibn Beshr, Thalaba Eljudami, and the rest of the people of Syria fled to Andalus. Abu Yusuf Elhowwari, who was a tyrant of the tyrants of the Berbers, pursued them, and he overtook them and gave them battle. Abu Yusuf was killed and his companions were put to flight. Balj and Thalaba passed over to Andalus. And Kolthum, while Abd-Elmalik Ibn Katan Elfihri was govenor of that country, had written to the inhabitants, ordering them to come to his assistance. Balj then met them, as they were coming down the straits of Alchadra. Abd Errahman Ibn Habib having arrived in Andalus before Balj, told Abd-Elmalik Ibn Katan not to listen to nor obey Balj. The latter then arrived and stopped in Alchadra, writing to Abd-Elmalik Ibn Katan, that he was the representative of Kolthum; Thalaba Eljudami and his companions bearing him witness to that; and the messenger between them on this subject was the Kadi of Andalus. Abd Elmalik Ibn Katan gave up to Balj the authority as governor, to the disgust of Abd Errahman Ibn Habib, who then disliking the authority of Balj, left Cordova. The latter, as soon as he came to Cordova, put Abd Elmalik Ibn Katan in prison. But Abd Errahman Ibn Habib and Umaiya Ibn Abd Elmalik Ibn Katan rebelled, and collected an

army in order to give Balj a battle. The latter let Abd Elmalik come out of prison, and said to him: „stand up in the Mosque and inform the people, that Kolthum wrote to thee, that I am his representative.“ But Abd Elmalik having stood up, said, O ye people! I am the governor appointed by Kolthum, and have been unjustly imprisoned. Balj then cut off his head. But Abd Errahman Ibn Habib advanced with troops. Balj and the Syrians who were with him, marched out against him; and there was a river between them. When the night came, Abd Errahman crossed to Cordova, where the representative of Balj was the Kadi. This being suspected of the murder of Abd Elmalik Ibn Katan, Abd Errahman Ibn Habib seized him, tore out his eyes, cut off his hands and his legs, struck off his head, and hung him on a tree, placing on his trunk the head of a swine, and Balj knew nothing of this. He afterwards left Cordova, and Balj then gave him battle and put him to flight. But he collected another army, and Balj and his companions were killed. It is said by others, Balj was not killed, he only died a natural death. Abd Errahman, on the authority of Yahya Ibn Bukeir, the latter on the authority of El-leyth, say: Balj died in the year 125, one month after he had put Abd Elmalik Ibn Katan to death. The inhabitants of Andalus, after that, were divided between four governors, up to the time Han'tala Ibn Safwan El-kelbi sent to them El-chattab El-kelbi who again united them: and I shall mention that in its proper place, if it please God thé highest.

Kolthum Ibn Iyadh had written to Safwan Ibn Abi Malik — his viceroy in Tripolis, to come to his assistance. The latter together with the people of Tripolis marched out to him until he came to Cabis, where he heard of the news of Kolthum and of his companions: he then returned, and Said Ibn Bajara and the companions of Maslama Ibn Sawada Eljudami who defended themselves, had marched out to him, and Elfazari escaped across a river of the name of Eljama, twelve miles distant from Cabis. When Safwan Ibn Abi Malik returned, Said Ibn Bajara and his companions were fortifying themself in Cabis. Abd Errahman Ibn Okba Elghifari set out with the people of Cairwan against Elfuzari, who then having met him between Cabis and

Cairwan, was put to flight, and the greatest number of his companions were killed.

Hisham Ibn Abd Elmalik afterwards sent Han'tala Ibn Safwan to Ifrikiya, in Safar of the year 124; he being his viceroy in Egypt. When he came to Ifrikiya, the people of Andalus — the Syrians and others, wrote to him, asking him to send them a governor. So he sent them Abu Elchattab whom, after he had come to Andalus, the inhabitants obeyed, so he ruled over the country which yielded him submission. He dispersed the army of Balj Ibn Beshr and of Abd Errahman Ibn Habib, and sent Thalaba Ibn Salama out to Ifrikiya in a ship, and after him he sent out Abd Errahman Ibn Habib, sending along with Thalaba the Syrians, who afterwards stopped in Cairwan with Han'tala. The latter then sent Abd Errahman Ibn Okba Elghifari against Ukasha Ibn Aiyub Elfuzari who, after his flight from Cabis, had collected a large army. Abd Errahman's associates then met him, and Elfuzari was put to flight, and the greatest number of his companions were killed. He again collected an army, but Abd Errahman Ibn Okba met him and put him to flight. He then assembled other troops, and Abd Elwahid Ibn Yezid Elhowwari, afterwards of the tribe Ettadham, came forward, and he was a Sofariy, agreeing with Elfuzari to give Han'tala Ibn Safwan a battle. Abd Errahman Ibn Okba together with the people of Ifrikiya marched out against both; but he and his companions were killed. Abd Errahman Ibn Okba was killed in the year 124; as Yahya Ibn 7
Bukeir, on the authority of El-leyth, says. Abd Elwahid Ibn Yezid then marched on and took Tunis; and having made himself governor of it, was greeted as Khalif. After that he advanced against Cairwan, and Elfuzari with his army occupied a district; each of the two went in the direction of Cairwan, both hastening for the first to arrive in the place and to make plunder.

When Han'tala saw what a crowd of Berbers had come to them with Elfuzari and Abd Elwahid, he dug a trench around Cairwan: Abd Elwahid having advanced towards them, wrote to Han'tala, ordering him to deliver Cairwan and its inhabitants into his hands. They then began to despair, and

believed so firmly, they would be taken prisoners, that, were Han'tala to send with them a messenger to bring him the news, he would not set out on a journey of three miles except for 50 dinars. When Abd Elwahid came to Han'tala, he was in a place of the name of Asnam which is about a day's journey from Cairwan. Elfuzari resided from the latter at the distance of six miles.

Abu Korra Elokeili was with Abd Elwahid, and was the commander of his advanced troops. Han'tala then wrote to Abd Elwahid a letter in which he sang his funeral dirge and frightened him, thinking that both would unite against him and that he could not conquer both, he was therefore afraid of a union between them. Ukasha was the nearest to Han'tala; Abd-Elwahid, then, with his army got up early at Asnam; Han'tala advanced against Elfuzari on account of his being near him, and he took along with him the inhabitants of Cairwan. A people then marched out in utter despair, because they were afraid that the children would be taken captives and the women and the property would be carried away. He made Mohammed Ibn Amru Ibn Okba who met them at Asnam their governor. But Allah put Abd Elwahid and his army to flight, and he together with his companions was killed in a battle, that is not known which it was, and he who chose to escape fled from the battle. When Allah gave the victory to Han'tala, he hastened on the same night to Elfuzari, and gave him battle in Karn, while Ukasha had not heard of the flight of Abd Elwahid. Allah then put him and his companions to flight, and Ukasha fled until he arrived in one of the districts of Ifrikiya, where some Berbers made him prisoner, and brought him to Han'tala who put him to death; for Abd Elwahid and the Sofariy were wont to consider it lawful to take the women captives. Ukasha and Abd Elwahid were killed in the year
7 125: as Abd Errahman, on the authority of Yahya Ibn Bukeir, and the latter on the authority of El-leyth, say. But while Abd Elwahid was encamping in Elasnam and Ukasha was in Karn — in the neighbourhood of Cairwan, Han'tala had written to Muawia Ibn Safwan his viceroy in Tripolis, ordering him to come to him with the inhabitants of that town. He marched

out till he came to Cabis, where he heard of the flight of Abd Elwahid and of Ukasha. Han'tala wrote to him in reference to some Berbers who had revolted in Nafzawa and had taken the people – its clients prisoners. So he with his companions went out against them and gave them battle; but Muawia Ibn Safwan was killed and the Sofariy were put to death, and all the clients that were found in their hands, were released. Han'tala then sent to the army of Muawia Zeyd Ibn Amru Elkelbi, who returned with it to Tripolis; while Abd Errahman Ibn Habib was in Cabis and Thalaba Ibn Salama Eljudami was with Han'tala.

When the news of Elwelid Ibn Yezid reached the Syrians who were in Ifrikiya, most part of their governors revolted, and Thalaba Ibn Salama set out for the East. Abd Errahman, on the authority of Yahya Ibn Bukeir, and the latter on the authority of El-leyth, say: Elwelid was killed on Thursday, three nights before the end of Jumada the second of the year 126. Abd Errahman Ibn Habib revolted in Tunis, and collected an army, in order to give Han'tala Ibn Safwan battle and to drive him out of Ifrikiya. When the latter heard of this, he sent to the former the chiefs of Ifrikiya, inviting him to keep the peace, and to abstain from discord. They then set out, but when they were on the road thither, they heard of the accession to power of Merwan Ibn Mohammed. So they wished to turn back; but Abd Errahman being told that Han'tala had sent him an embassy of fifty men and that the latter would fain turn back, he sent them a cavalry who made them return to him, and Abd Errakman blamed them for marching out against him. And they had, unknown to Han'tala, written to him before this. On hearing of the accession to power of Merwan, they desisted prosecuting their journey. Abd Errahman then sent them in chains to Tunis, and wrote to Han'tala to deliver Cairwan into his hands, and to leave the city within the space of three days; and he wrote to the lord of the treasury house, to give him neither dinar nor dirhem except what was allowed him for his livelihood. When Han'tala read this letter, he thought of giving him battle; but being a moderate man he desisted from pursuing that course. He then marched out ac-

companied by the Syrians who travelled in his suit. This was in Jumada the first of the year 126. Abd Errahman Ibn Habib entered Cairwan in Jumada the second of the year 126, and then sent his brother Ibn Habib as viceroy to Tripolis. He imprisoned Ibn Masgud Ettajibi, Ibadhiy — a chief of that sect and a Kadi. He then cut off his head, and the Ibadhiye revolted in Tripolis. Abd Errahman deposed his brother, and appointed Humeid Ibn Abd Allah Elakki governor, and he was the chief of the Ibadhiye at the time of the rebellion of Abd Eljabbar Ibn Keis Elmuradi and of Harith Ibn Talid Elhathrami. They besieged Humeid Ibn Allah in a certain town of Tripolis, and the disease attacked his companions. He then set out having first made a treaty for his own safety. When they were gone, Abd Eljabbar seized Nosseyr Ibn Rashid a freedman of Elanzar, and put him to death, and he was one of the companions of Humeid, whom they used to seek on account of the murder of Abd Allah Ibn Masgud. Abd Eljabbar was governor of Zenata and its territory. Abd Errahman Ibn Habib wrote to Yezid Ibn Safwan Elmogafiri, making him governor of Tripolis, and sent Mojahid Ibn Moslem the Howwari, to entice the soldiers and to cut Abd Eljabbar from Howwara and from other tribes. Mojahid stopped in Howwara some months, after that they banished him. He then adhered to Yezid Ibn Safwan in Tripolis. Abd Errahman Ibn Habib sent by Mohammed Ibn Mafruk, and wrote to Yezid Ibn Safwan to march out along with him; and they set out. But Abd Eljabbar Ibn Keis and Elharith Ibn Talid met them in a province of Howwara. Yezid Ibn Safwan and Mohammed Ibn Mafruk were killed, while Mojahid Ibn Moslem fled to a province of Howwara. Abd Errahman Ibn Habib then marched with a large retinue, and there assembled around him a large army with which he advanced against Abd Eljabbar and Elharith Ibn Talid, and he met them in a district of Zenata, where Amru Ibn Othman and his companions were put to flight; and Abd Eljabbar and Elharith made themselves masters of the whole of Tripolis. After that Amru Ibn Othman together with Mojahid Ibn Moslem marched out to Dagoga, and Elharith Ibn Talid pursued him. Amru then proceeded from Dagoga to the dis-

trict of the Sahra, but Elharith followed him. Amru afterwards advanced to Surt and was pursued by Elharith's cavalry, who killed a number of his companions; and Amru being wounded, escaped on his horse. Elharith collected his army, and the power of Eljabbar and Elharith became great, and a quarrel arose between them which subsequently became serious. They fought each other, and both were killed at the same time. The Berbers then made Isma'il Ibn Zeiyad Ennafusi their governor: his influence was important, and his homage great. Abd Errahman Ibn Habib marched out against him until he came to Cabis, when the son of his uncle — Shueib Ibn Othman advanced to him with a cavalry; he met Isma'il and killed him and his companions, and made prisoners of a great number of the Berbers. Abd Errahman stopped with his army, having not witnessed the catastrophe. When he had obtained the victory, he went up to the forum of Tripolis, taking the prisoners along with him; and he wrote to Amru Ibn Othman; the latter then came to him from the district Surt and delivered up the prisoners: he then cut off their necks and hung them, and appointed Amru Ibn Sawid Elmoradi governor of the district of Tripolis, and ordered him to come over. The end of the fifth part of the conquest of Egypt.

Exegetical Notes.

1. Andalus. Arabic writers agree in designating Spain by the name of Andalus, yet differ in their account of the Etymology of the word. The discrepancy of opinions prevailing on this point, renders it desirable that we should state the different views, and show which of them has the greatest degree of probability in its favour. The most ancient derivation of the word Andalus connects the name of the country with Andalus, the son of Tubal, the son of Japheth, the son of Noah; the posterity of whom, according to tradition, were the first inhabitants of Spain, and for many successive centuries its governors — at last they disappeared, their race either becoming extinct or their history amalgamated with that of other nations, who from time to time made themselves masters of the country. This opinion of the origin of the word which is defended by Lembke*), is supported by no historical evidence; and must, therefore, be regarded as a gratuitous supposition, which originated in a desire which the Arabs had, in common with almost all the nations of antiquity, to claim an ancient hero as the father of their country. But it remains to be proved that there is any connexion between the two names, notwithstanding their great similarity in sound.

2. Casiri**) derives the word Andalos from the Arabic word جندلس, which in his opinion is to be pronounced Handalos, and signifies „Regionem vespertinam et tenebrosam, atque etiam occidentis finem.“ But this derivation, besides being contrary to the nature of the word which evidently is not of

*) Geschichte von Spanien, p. 255. Note 1.

**) Bibliotheca Arabico-Hispana Escurialensis Vol. II, 328.

Arabic origin, is liable to two other objections, the one referring to the meaning of the word, and the other to its pronunciation. In a Lexicon entitled Kamus, حندلس is said to signify. „A she camel of an awkward gait, and with a loose and pendent skin.“ And in the same book it is further remarked that the word is not pronounced Handalos, but always Handalis.

3. The Etymology which is commonly assigned to the word Andalus, is correct; inasmuch as it is free from the difficulties in which the above-quoted derivations are involved. The name is accordingly derived from the Vandals — a people, whose residence in Spain is supported by unquestionable historical evidence. Dr. Lembke objects to this derivation of the word Andalus, on the ground that the Vandals being resident in Spain only a short time, could not have stamped on the country their name; they did not even succeed in doing so in Africa, on the coast of which they dwelt for a longer period. But Lembke seems to have forgotten that other circumstances, besides that of a nation's long residence in a country, effect a change of the names by which the land was previously known.

In adopting Lembke's view of the Etymology of the word, we shall be necessitated to suppose that Andalus is the most ancient appellation by which Spain was called; but this is so far from being the case, that in the Classic authors the country is always designated by the name of Iberia and Hispania respectively. And Elmakkari*) is wrong in deriving the word Hispania from Vespasian, as if the country received that name first in the time of that emperor; whereas, on the contrary, Spain was so called by the Romans as soon as it became a Roman province.

2. Berbers. As to the origin of the Berbers different opinions are entertained. According to Ibn Abd El-Hakem, they originally came from Palestine, and were the subjects of Goliath who was killed by king David in a duel. They emigrated towards the West, and settled in Libya and Marmarica, two provinces of western Egypt. Having arrived there, they

*) De Gayangos' Translation, Vol. I, p. 24, and p. 323.

soon dispersed: the Zenata and the Maghila marching further westward, inhabited the mountainous parts of the country: the Lowata established themselves in the territory of Autabolos (Pentapole of Cyrene), which is commonly known by the name of Barca. This tribe afterwards spread itself in that part of the country till at last its dominions reached as far as Sus. The Howwara dwelt in Leptis magna, and the Nefowsa fixed their abode in the town Sabra (Sabratha). See Ibn Abd El-Hakem p. 86, and 87. Slane's Translation of Ibn Khaldun History of the Berbers, Appendix. I.

The different views which have been entertained on the Etymology of the word Berber and on the origin of the Berber nation, being communicated at full length in a seperate chapter of Ibn Khaldun's History of the Berbers *), we refer the reader to the said work for further information on these subjects.

3. البتر, البرانس. The Berber nation, according to Ibn Khaldun, was divided into two large tribes — the Botr and the Beranes. These again formed themselves into separate branches, some of which have been mentioned in the preceding note. But unless we slightly alter the text in this passage we can find no name, among the numerous tribes of the Berbers, corresponding to those which are here mentioned. We have, therefore, made the above-alteration with the view of restoring the correct reading. See further on the names of these two Berber tribes, Note 33.

4. Sus El-Adna. السوس الادنى. The province Sus is bounded north by the Atlas, East by the Dera land, South by the Dera river, and West by the Atlantic. The northern part of the country was called El-Adna, and the southern El-Acsa. The river Sus, according to Slane, ran through the province of Sus El-Adna, issuing from the mountain Atlas and discharging itself in the Atlantic sea.

According to Abulfeda (p. 103), the whole land south of the mountain Daran in the direction of the desert Sahra, and according to others, the country of Darah, belong to the province of Sus El-Adna.

---

*) See Vol. I. p. ٧١, et seq. Slane's Translation, p. 167 — 186.

5. Ilyan. The name of Ilyan is variously written by Mohammedan und Christian authors. He is commonly called by the latter Julian, and in the work of Ibn Abd El-Hakem Bilián, which name is evidently a corrupt form of the word Ilyan, arising from the point of the Jâ being left out.

The several questions which are connected with Ilyan's history, but which have been unsatisfactorily discussed by our predecessors, call here for especial attention. Masdeu and most Spanish critics arrived at the conclusion that Ilyan is no historical character, and denied that any such person ever lived. And Pascual De Gayangos*), after comparing the various statements of Mohammedan and Christian authors relative to Ilyan's history, remarks: „That writers before the 11the century, if they mention Ilyan at all, say nothing of his misunderstanding with Roderic."

This assertion is only correct in reference to the Christian authors of the period just specified, but erroneous as far as the Mohammedan writers are concerned: for, of the former, the Monk of Silos, who wrote towards the beginning of the 12the century, is the first Spanish author who mentions Ilyan; but of the latter Ibn Abd El-Hakem aud Ibn El-Kouthiya — both writers of the 9the century, not only record his name, but also affirm that the Saracen invasion of Spain was undertaken in consequence of Ilyan's quarrel with king Roderic. Besides, Ed-Dehebi in his annals, has a long article with which De Gayangos was not acquainted, and which will help us on to a more accurate knowledge of the origin of Ilyan and of his descendants. He says: Abu Suleyman-Aiyub, Ibn El-Hakem, Ibn Abd Allah, Ibn Melka Bitro Ibn Ilyan, was originally a Goth. He studied under Baki Ibn Mokhelled, and derived much benefit from the lectures of his Teacher. ——— Ilyan who conducted the Moslems into Spain was his ancestor. He died in the year 326 (937 – 8). see Slane's Translation. Appendix. II. p. 346, Note 3.

We can then attach little or no weight to the silence observed by the earlier Spanish authors on the history of Ilyan,

---

*) Vol. I. p. 513.

perceiving that we are enabled from the unanimous testimony of the best Mohammedan writers, to answer satisfactorily the questions which have been mooted. And we need not be surprised that the Christian authors pass Ilyan's name unnoticed, when we consider how deficient these are in information on points of vital importance connected with history of this period: and further, that they might have a motive for concealment in the present instance, — being not anxious to communicate to posterity the name of Ilyan, because he treacherously sacrificed the public interest of the Gothic kingdom to his private grudge against the then ruling king.

2. The question as to Ilyan's existence having been settled, we shall next consider his origin, and his relation to the Goths. De Gayangos*), after summing up the evidences of the authors he had consulted, comes to the following conclusion relative to Ilyan's origin: „Ilyan no doubt belonged to that mixed population, — the relics of all nations that had empires on the coast of Africa after the fall of Carthage, — Romans, Numidians, Vandals, Greeks. And as to Ilyan's relation to the Goths the same author remarks: „It is naturally to conclude that Ilyan, if at all dependent on the Gothic monarchs, was not, properly speaking, their subject**)."

Both these conclusions cannot but be regarded as pure conjectures; for the one contradicts the testimony of Ibn Abd El-Hakem, the weight of whose authority is sufficient to decide the question of Ilyan's relation to the Goths: the other conclusion mililates against the statement of Ed-Dehebi, which has already been quoted. The testimony of the latter author is the more valuable in the present case, inasmuch as other writers have expressed themselves somewhat indefinitely as to the nation to which Ilyan belonged. Ibn Abd El-Hakem for instance calls him simply a foreigner, — a name by which Arabic writers designate a person who is not of their own nation.

3. We proceed next to inquire into the event which made

*) Vol. I. p. 539.
**) Vol. I. p. 540.

Ilyan's name first conspicuous in history. De Gayangos*) says: „Al-bekri, Idrisi, Ibnu Hayyan, Ibnu Khaldun, and the best writers of Mohammedan Spain, assert that „when Okba Ibn Nafi invaded Western Africa, the Governor or Lord of Ceuta, whose name was Ilyan, the same who afterwards led Tarik into Spain, came out to meet him with presents, and asked for peace, which the Arabian general granted, leaving the Christian in possession of the city and of his other estates." This conclusion, however well supported by the testimony of the above-mentioned authors, is liable to one serious objection, — viz. that it is at variance with a statement of Ibn Abd-El-Hakem and of El-Makkari; both of whom recount another tradition, which is to the effect, that Tangiers had not been taken before the time of Musa Ibn Nosseyr.

Weil was the first to point out the discrepancy in the sources on this question, and from a comparison of the different testimonies, to arrive at a conclusion the very opposite to that which had commonly been acquiesced in. And we admit that he was right in calling attention to the difficulties which this part of Ilyan's history presents, and which are of so serious a nature, that they should not be overlooked by any author who is desirous to obtain satisfactory results on this subject. Nevertheless we cannot but think that Weil has attached undue weight to the statement of Ibn Abd-El-Hakem and El-Makkari, without assigning sufficient reasons for rejecting the almost unanimous testimony of Mohammedan writers, or for believing that the latter intentionally or otherwise, have taken the expedition of Okba against Tangiers for that of Musa against that city; though the space of 28 years elapsed between the two events.

As we differ from Weil on this question, it is but fair that we should critically examine the several arguments which he adduces in favour of his opinion. These are the following**):

1. That Ibn Abd El-Hakem and El-Makkari expressly

---

*) Vol. I. p. 538.

**) Geschichte der Chalifen, Vol. I. p. 289.

state that Musa was the first Arabic governor who entered Tangiers.

2. That the expeditions which are ascribed by Arabic authors to Okba and Musa respectively, were undertaken under different circumstances: — Ilyan, having in the one case, gone out of his own accord to meet Okba with presents; whereas in the other, he is said to have offered stout opposition to the arms of Musa; which the latter was unable to overcome till the former had quarrelled with king Roderic.

3. That Mohammedan writers, in recording the Saracen invasion of Spain, do not mention Ilyan as if he were already known to them, much less do they seem aware that he had already enjoyed the friendship of the Arabs for the space of 28 years; for such is the interval which elapsed between the expedition of Okba and that of Musa.

We have grouped these arguments together, as we shall have occasion, in examining their respective value, to mention facts which have a common reference to each of them.

As to the first of these arguments, it must be admitted, that it possesses considerable weight, and it seems to be the only one of Weil's long list of arguments, which is calculated to raise doubts in the mind of the reader, in reference to the correctness of the generally received opinion. There is, however, one circumstance which Weil has overlooked, and the consideration of which cannot fail to diminish the force of his objection: viz. that, Ibn Abd El-Hakem in stating that Musa was the first Arabic governor who ever entered Tangiers, does not confirm the truth of that report; but, on the contrary, he mentions another tradition, according to which, Musa sent his son Merwan to Tangiers. The latter, after having valiantly fought for some time, returned, leaving Tarik, a freedman of Musa, as general of the army. We are thus left at liberty by Ibn Abd El-Hakem, to choose between the two traditions recorded, and we naturally prefer the account which seems to be the least at variance with the testimony of other trustworthy authors. And though we cannot reconcile the contradictory statements which the original sources exhibit in reference to the first taking of Tangiers by the Arabs, yet the consideration of the

circumstances under which this event took place, may enable us to judge rightly of the manner in which this discrepancy might have arisen. The circumstances, under which the two expeditions into Tangiers were undertaken, were so different in character as almost to preclude the possibility of the one being mistaken for the other. And the time which elapsed between these two events, was not calculated to lead any author to confound them. How, then, are we to account for the discrepancy in the original documents on the point in question? To which we answer that the conquest of Tangiers by Okba was of such a nature that it might have led some authors to pass that event unnoticed.

1. Okba's conquest of Tangiers was easily made; Ilyan having of his own accord yielded him submission.

2. Okba granted easy terms to the conquered city; for Ilyan was permitted to remain in possession of Tangiers and its district, and to conduct the administration of public affairs in the same manner as he had done, previous to the arrival of the Arabs in the province. The authority of Okba was on the part of Ilyan more nominally recognised than really felt.

3. Okba's dominion over Tangiers seems not to have been of long duration: for in the period of time which elapsed between the treaty of Ilyan with Okba and the arrival of Musa Ibn Nosseyr in Africa, the Berbers having revolted against the Arabs, defeated them in several encounters. During this interval Ilyan seems to have shaken off the yoke of the Moslems, by making a common cause with the enemy against them. The exact date of this insurrection we have no means of ascertaining, though we know for certain that Ilyan stood in a hostile relation to the Arabs, when Musa arrived in Africa; for we are informed that Tangiers was taken by the latter or by his freedman Tarik, after a determined resistance on the part of Ilyan.

This then being the case, it cannot appear remarkable that in the records of some Traditionists no mention is made of the first conquest of Tangiers by the Arabs, and that a later date has consequently been assigned to that event. Arabic writers who mention Ilyan in connexion with the taking of Tangiers by Musa, do not seem to recognise in him the man

who had already enjoyed the friendship of their nation for the space of 28 years: for, we have already seen, Ilyan was no friend of the Arabs, when Musa arrived in Africa: besides, the acquaintance of the Moslems, which was forced upon him by Okba, and received on his part for the sake of peace, never grew into friendship, much less into intimacy; for it was soon interrupted by new acts of hostility of one party against the other.

4. In order to prove the correctness of the tradition recorded by Ibn Abd El-Hakem and El-Makkari, Weil further remarks that Arabic authors often assign to victories a date earlier than that at which they were achieved. This may be true as a general proposition, but its application to the present case remains to be proved.

5. Weil further observes that authors might have been led to confound the expedition of Okba with that of Musa, from the circumstance that a town as well as a land was known by the name of Sus. He admits the correctness of the tradition, according to which, Okba made an inroad into the land of Sus; but pronounces the account which is given of the expedition of Okba into the town of Sus, erroneous; and he further remarks that the latter tradition might have arisen from the former.

This argument would be of great weight, were the expedition of Okba into Tangiers so associated with the name of Sus, that the latter were always referred to in all the records of that event. But this is far from being the case. Okba's expedition is not so much connected with Sus as with Tangiers: and that this city was taken by him, is probable from the tradition which is recounted by the best Mohammedan authors, and which is to the effect, that Okba finding no more land to conquer, plunged his horse into the waves of the Atlantic sea. And corroborative of the correctness of the account that Okba conquered Tangiers, is the testimony of Shehabuddin, an African historian of note, who asserts that Okba, after entering Tangiers, expressed a wish to cross over to Spain, but was dissuaded by Ilyan from the undertaking.

We have thus discussed in details the question of Ilyan's

first appearance on the stage of history, being convinced of the fallacy of the arguments which have been brought forward against the generally received opinion. But these, with the exception of the argument first quoted, seem to us of no great force; for being somewhat far-fetched, they tend to weaken rather than stengthen the theory which they are intended to support.

4. We proceed next to consider the relative position of Ilyan to the Goths and to the Africans.

The titles by which Ilyan is designated, furnish us with the best means of ascertaining his position in life. And the variety of these appellations indicates the manifold relations in which he stood to different parties. Some authors call him a merchant, others a king of the African tribe of „Ghomarah," and a great number Lord of Septa and Tangiers. The designation of foreign merchant is difficult to explain, though he is known by that name to some of the best historians. Nevertheless the following facts which are compiled from different Arabic authors, may extend our knowledge on the subject, as well as enable us to judge of the propriety of the name of „merchant" being applied to Ilyan.

1. Ibn Abd El-Hakem asserts, that Ilyan's companions were merchants.

2. The same author intimates, that a commercial intercourse was carried on between Spain and Africa at the time of the Saracen expedition into the former country, for he says, that Tarik and his friends effected a landing on the coast of Spain, without exciting the suspicions of the Goths, the latter thinking that the ships in which the Arabs sailed, were the merchant vessels which regularly crossed and recrossed the straits.

3. Ibn Elkouthiya*) who calls Ilyan a foreign merchant, and a dealer in falcons and race horses, asserts, that Ilyan on the occasion of his last visit to king Roderic, said to the latter, „I have in store for thee horses and hawks, such as thou never sawest before in thy life." The same author further re-

*) Journal Asiatique Ser. 5. Tom. 8. p. 435.

marks that Ilyan was in the habit of crossing from Andalus to the country of the Berbers, and that he was accustomed to bring to Roderic horses, falcons, and other productions of Africa *). It is more than probable, that Ilyan at the time of the Saracen invasion into Andalus, was a governor of a Spanish colony on the coast of Africa: for Ibn Elkouthiya says, that „;the city of Tangiers was his residence, and he ruled in it as a master; the inhabitants professed the Christian religion.“ It admits of no doubt that the Goths established themselves early on the coast of Africa; though we cannot speak for certain of the occasion of their leaving their native land to try their fortune on foreign shores.

5. We now come to discuss the last point connected with Ilyan's history, we mean his quarrel with king Roderic, originating in the insult he had received in the person of his daughter. From the romantic character of the history of the latter, some modern authors have pronounced the account fabulous. They admit, at the same time, that it is narrated by almost all the best writers of Mohammedan Spain.

Lembke **) assumes that Roderic ascended the throne in the year 711. Hence he infers that the reports of the events which occurred in consequence of Ilyan's quarrel with Roderic, are inconsistent with the supposition that the latter was king only one year. He, therefore, rejects the story regarding the dishonour of Ilyan's daughter as incorrect. But this objection of Lembke cannot be applied to the account which Ibn Abd El-Hakem gives of the circumstances connected with the Mohammedan expedition into Spain: for it is evident from the narrative of the last-mentioned author. that Musa was seeking an opportunity of invading Andalus, and that Ilyan's proposal to embark in that undertaking was eagerly seized by the Moslems; and so far from taking time to consult the Khalif on the matter, the Arabs departed on their expedition without asking his consent. It must, however, be admitted that all the diffi-

*) See de Gayangos' Translation, Vol. I, p. 514.

**) Geschichte von Spanien, p. 258.

culties which are involved in Lemke's objection are not easily solved, especially if it be granted that Roderic's reign lasted only one year. Hence Weil*) perceiving the force of this objection, has endeavoured to meet the difficulty, by supposing, that Roderic is called by Ibn Abd El-Hakem „the Lord of Andalus" on account of his becoming afterwards the king of the country, though he had not perhaps acceded to power when he dishonoured Ilyan's daughter. But this interpretation is not only inconsistent with the natural construction of the words of the author, but is also at variance with a fact which is mentioned by the best historians of Mohammedan Spain. And unless we take this into consideration we cannot perceive the propriety of Ilyan sending his daughter to Roderic. The fact to which we allude is, that it was a custom among the Goths for the princes of the royal blood, the great noblemen of the kingdom, and the governors of the provinces, to send their daughters to the royal palace to be educated. In compliance with this custom Ilyan sent his daughter to king Roderic, who fell in love with her at first sight, and when persuasion had failed, obtained by force the gratification of his wishes**).

The father, on hearing of his daughter's dishonour, immediately embarked for Andalus; and under the pretence, of his wife being on the point of death, and desirous to see her child, he requested the king to give him back his daughter. From the ambiguous language which Ilyan employed on his last visit to king Roderic, we would infer that he had already fixed upon his plans of revenge. These were put into execution, when the opportunity occurred, of making them known to the Moslems. From the tradition of Ibn Abd El-Hakem, we conclude that only a short time elapsed between Tarik's first communication with Ilyan, and the final overthrow of the Gothic kingdom. The Arabs acted so far with caution, that they demanded hostages for their own personal safety. These being granted, the Moslems embarked in the expedition with all possible speed.

---

*) Geschichte der Chalifen, Vol. I, p. 516.

**) El-Makkari translated by De Gayangos, Vol. I, p. 256.

Weil remarks correctly, that there is no reason to believe that the Arabs invented the story of the dishonur of Ilyan's daughter; they may, however, have erred, in assigning that incident as the only motive which induced the Count to betray his countrymen.

6. سبتة. Septa or Ceuta. A city situated on the mouth of بحر الزقاق*) (straits of Gibraltar) in the province of Berbery. It is the same with the „castellum ad septem fratres" of Plinius*); its name Septa is derived from septem, the town being built on seven hills. Edrisi***) on the other hand, derives the word Septa from the Arabic word سبت „secuit, resecuit," the city being surrounded by the sea on every side except the Western.

7. Alchadra („the green island"), situated on a hill on the banks of the river Shelef, its modern name is Algesiras. See Edrisii Africa, Edit. Hartmann, p. 208.

8. Telemsen, was an ancient city in the province of Berbery. According to Abulfeda, it lay at the foot of the mountain Sabrastain. It was surrounded with strong ramparts, and abounded in Mosques, Colleges, Baths, and Hospitals. See Edrisii Africa, p. 191, 192

9. Cairwan, was the capital of Africa proper, according to Edrisi (p. 255), it lay 4 days' journey northeast from Cafsa, 2 from Tunis. It surpassed all the towns of the province, in wealth and commerce, as well as in its edifices and bazaars.

Cairwan was probably founded in the year 50 A. H. by Okba Ibn Nafi****).

On the situation of Cairwan; See Weil Vol. p. 286; where the different opinions which have been entertained on that point, are considered.

10. Tarik Ibn Zeiyad as he is called in most mss.; in others,

---

*) Geographie d'Edrisi, t. I, p. 225. Nouv. Journ. Asiatique, ser. 3. p. 189.

**) Historiae naturalis, lib. V, cap. II.

***) Edrisii Africa, edit. Hartmann p. 178.

****) See Weil Geschichte der Chalifen, Vol. I, p. 283—84. Slane's Translation of Ibn Khallikan, Vol. I, note 3.

Tarik Ibn Amru; by Edrisi *), Tarik Ibn Abd Allah; and by Rodericus Toletanus **), Tarik Abenzarca. Abu Zara is the name by which Tarif's father is generally known; but as Tarif and Tarik are often confounded by authors, it is probable that Roderic of Toledo has also mistaken the father of the one for that of the other. To account for these various appellations of Tarik's father, is not an easy task, especially as nothing further is known of Tarik's early history, than, that, according to most traditions, he was the freedman of Musa Ibn Nosseyr. Slane ***) remarks that Ibn Abd El-Hakem does not mention Tarif, but that he speaks of two Tarik, — Tarik Ibn Amr and Tarik Ibn Abbad.

In Ewald's ms. Ibn Zeiyad is written, but not Ibn Abbad. The latter name can nowise be right; for Tarik is never so called. Ibn Zeiyad, on the contrary, is his usual appellation. Fournel might have been of service to us in this case, had he consulted the original text of Ibn Abd El-Hakem's work instead of merely transcribing Slane's note.

The names that are employed to denote Tarik's nation or tribe, exhibit still a greater variety than those by which his father is known. He is called Ezzenati by Edrisi ****) Elleythi and Ennefezi by Ibn Khaldun *****), Elberberi and Essadfi by El-Makkari ******). These various names of Tarik's father and tribe probably arose from the uncertainty which prevailed in the ancient traditions on Tarik's early history.

Of Tarik's ultimate destination and end we are not informed; for, after his departure from Spain and his return to the

---

*) Geographie d'Edrisi, traduite de l'Arabe par Jaubert, t. II, p. 17.

**) Historia Arabum, cap. IX, p. 9 in Elmacini Hist. sarac. Lugd. Batav. 1625.

***) Hist. les Berb. p. 346.

****) Geographie d'Edrisi, t. II, p. 17.

*****) Hist. de l'Afr. sous dynast. des Aghlab. p. ٧.

******) De Gayangos' p. 253, and p. 266 El-Makkari calls him Ibn Zeiyad Ibn Abdallah, a native of Hemdan, in Persia, although some pretend that he was not a freedman of Musa Ibn Nosseyr, but a free-born man of the tribe of Sadf, while others make him a *Mawla* of Lakhm.

East, no mention is made of him. According to some traditions, he was made by the Khalif Suleyman governor of Spain; but on hearing of his great influence with the army, Suleyman recalled his appointment, fearing that Tarik would act in his own name, and bring about a rebellion in the country against the authority of the Khalif.

11. The account which Ibn Abd El'-Hakem gives of Tarik's conduct towards the vinedressers, is given more in details by El-Makkari and other historians. In Ibn Elkouthiya's there is no mention made of this story,

12. The fable of the house, the door of which was secured with padlocks, is recounted by almost all the historians of Mohammedan Spain. El-Makkari*) says, that Spain was invaded in consequence of Roderic's impiety in causing this house to be opened.

13. شذونة Shidunia. It is by no means an easy task to decide which city is here meant by Shidonia; for two cities are known to Arabic writers by that name — viz. Xeres, and Medina Sidonia of the present day, the then capital of the district called Kurah Shidunah, and which is the same with the Asido of the Romans**).

Xeres was also at a later period called Shidonia, though we cannot fix upon the exact time in which it received that name. We would infer from the fact of Shidonia being simply mentioned in the text, that only one city was so designated in the time in which Ibn Abd El-Hakem wrote. As there is no proof of Xeres being called Shidonia in the 8th or 9th century, and as Medina Shidonia has been known under the same name or a modification of the same during every period of its history, it is probable that the last-mentioned city is here meant. De Gayangos (p. 525) and Weil (p. 520) are of opinion, that the battle which decided the fate of the Gothic kingdom, was fought in the vicinity of Medina Shidonia and not in that of Xeres. The latter city, however, was formerly believed to be the place in wich this important event occurred. And Fournel

*) De Gayangos, p. 262.

**) Geographic d'Aboulfeda traduction de M. Reinaud, t. II, p. 236.

(p. 58) quoting a passage from Ibn El-Khetib (Casiri t. II, p. 183, col. I.) advocates the view that the battle was fought in the neighbourhood of Xeres.

14. Roderic. Nothing is known for certain of Roderic's family or of the history of his early career. If we follow some traditions, we must believe that he was the general of the army previous to his accession to supreme power. On the date of this latter event and on the duration of Roderic's reign the original documents are by no means unanimous: and it is difficult to decide these questions, on account of the obscurity which envelops the latter part of his predecessor's reign. Following the chronology of Masdeu *) Fournel (p. 49) dates the accession of Roderic to the throne from the 15th of Feb. 709 *); and he assigns to Roderic's reign the duration of somewhat longer than two years; for he says (p. 58) the battle of Guadelete was fought on the 25th of July 711. Rodericus Toletanus **) says that Witiza was deposed before his death, in consequence of an insurrection which broke out in his kingdom. And Roderic elected by the Goths, became Witiza's successor to the throne. And according to Baronius ***), Witiza died in the year 710, having been king for the period of 9 years.

According to the „Chronicon Sebastiani" ****) Witiza after a reign of 10 years died in the year 708, and Roderic was elected by the Goths as his successor. Isidorus Pacensis *****) says that Roderic was king only one year; and Rodericus Toletanus ******) dates his accession to power from the year 709. Ibn Etkouthiya *******) asserts that Roderic usurped the throne during the minority of the sons of Witiza, while their mother reigned in their name. The number and the names of these

*) Hist. critica de Espana, lib. II, Cronol. Illustr, X, §. 5, t. X, p. 326.

**) Hispaniae illustratae, t. II, p. 62, cap. XVII; in fol. Francofurti. 1603.

***) Annales ecclesiastici, t. XII, p. 22; in fol. Lucae, 1742.

****) Espana Sagrada, Vol. XIII, p. 478.

*****) Esp. Sag. Vol. VIII, p. 290, Rudericus tumultuose regnum hortante Senatu invadit. Regnat anno uno.

******) lib. III, cap. XVIII.

*******) Journal Asiatique, ser. 5, tom. 8, p 430.

are variously given; Rodericus Toletanus makes them only two, and calls them Sisibert and Eba. Ibn Elkouthiya says they were three, the eldest of whom was called Almounz, the second Roumlouh, and the third Ardebast. Different traditions exist as to the part these took in the conquest of Andalus. The Monk of Silos*) asserts that they were banished by king Roderic, and that they sought refuge in the province of Tangiers by the Count Ilyan, an old friend of their father. This circumstance, in Fournel's opinion (p. 53) sufficiently accounts for the encouragement which the Arabs received, to cross over to Andalus. In aiding the Arabs in their expedition into Spain, Ilyan was accordingly actuated merely by feelings of friendship towards the sons of Witiza, and not by those of revenge against Roderic. But if we suppose, on the other hand, that the king dishonoured Ilyan's daughter, soon after his accession to power, we may believe that Ilyan was induced by a double motive to act the traitor to his native land — namely by the attachment to the family of the late monarch and by the desire to see the then ruling king dethroned, on account of the injury he had inflicted upon his daughter. Others say that the sons of Witiza went of their own accord across to Africa, thinking that, by the assistance of Musa, they would have their father's throne restored to them; for they hoped that the prospect of acquiring booty would be a sufficient inducement to the Arabs to embark in the expedition. Having closed a contract to that effect with the Arabian general, they returned into Spain; and on the day of battle the young princes together with their party went over to the side of the enemy**).

On the improbability of this account being correct, see Weil Geschichte der Chalifen, Vol. I, p. 525. De Gayangos, p. 528.

15. The table of Suleyman Ibn Dawid. Procopius***) and Gibbon believing that this table was formerly found in Jerusa-

*) Esp. Sag. Vol. XVII, p. 278.

**) Journal Asiatique, Ser. 5, tom. 8, p. 431, 432.

***) Procop. de bello Goth. Lib. I, Cap. XII de bell. Vandal. Lib. II, Cap. IX.

lem and once the property of king Solomon, have endeavoured to account for its removal from East to West, by supposing that Titus at the sack of Jerusalem carried it away into Rome, and that the Goths at the taking of that city by Alaric, removed it to Andalus.

Some Arabic authors maintain, that this table was carried away into Spain by thos eJews who, immediately after the destruction of Jerusalem, emigrated into that country, taking along with them many precious relics of their former splendour, among which this table is especially mentioned*).

Ibn Haiyan gives another account of the origin of this table, and El-Makkari**) quoting the words of that historian, seems to have adopted his opinion. Ibn Haiyan says, according to the barbarian authors, it was customary among kings and other high persons in Christian countries to bequeath a portion of their property to the church. From the money so collected tables, thrones, and crowns were wont to be made, in compliance with the orders of the priests, and for the purpose of carrying the gospel in public processions, and of ornamenting the altars on great festivals. By means of such bequests the table bearing the name of Solomon, was wrought at Toledo, and being embellished by each succeeding monarch, it became at last a most precious jewel.

Of the two above accounts of the origin of this table, there can be no doubt at present as to the probability of the one being true and the other false. It is not remarkable that the table should bear Solomon's name, though it never belonged to him, for the Orientals were wont to regard Solomon as a great performer of miracles, the founder of great temples and castles, with the origin of which they were not acquainted. On the other hand, we cannot but admire the ingenuity which Procopius' and Gibbon's theory displays, though we do not agree with the views which this theory is intended to uphold: and had they been able to prove that the table was actually found in Jerusalem at the

*) Lembke Geschichte von Spanien, Beilage III.

**) De Gayangos, Vol. I, p. 286, 287.

time of the sack of that city by the Romans. their method of accounting for the origin of the table would have been more probable. But as they have not endeavoured to do this, we cannot but prefer the tradition of the Christian authors on the subject.

Tabari's account of the place in which the table was found by Tarik, differs from that given by Ibn Abd El-Hakem. The former, after mentioning Musa's reception by his freedman, describes in the following words the town where the table of Solomon was deposited; p. 183; ووجّهه منها الى مدينه طُلَيْطِـله وهى من عظار مداين الاندلس وهى من قرطبه على عشـريــن يــوما فاصاب فيها مَايدَة سليمن ابن داوود فيها من الذهب والجــوهر ما الله أعْلم به The different traditions as to the place where the table was found by Tarik, seem at first sight irreconcilable, and the difficulty arising from the contradictory statements can only be solved by supposing that the table was originally in Toledo, but that the inhabitants of that city, on hearing of the approach of Tarik's army, had it secretly conveyed to the town which was afterwards called Medina Almaida. This was probably done with the intention of saving it from falling into the hands of the Arabs.

Slane*) remarks that, according to one tradition mentioned by Ibn Abd El-Hakem, this remarkable table was found in Narbonne.

As there is no reference made to this tradition in the copy of Ibn Abd El-Hakem's which we have used, we cannot but regret that Slane has not quoted the words of the author and pointed out the page in which these are written. De Gayangos p. 534 has decided the question of the locality of Medina Almaida, and the results of his investigations on this point are the more satisfactory, as they agree with Ibn Abd El-Hakem's description of the place**).

16. On the various dates assigned by Arabic writers to

*) Hist. des Berb. Vol. I, p. 349.

**) Weil Geschichte der Chalifen, Vol. I, p. 530, n. 1.

Musa's landing on the coast of Spain, see Gayangos, Vol. I, p. 535, 536; and Fournel, p. 62. Tabari, p. 182, gives the same date to this event as Ibn Abd El-Hakem.

17. Habib Ibn Abi Obeida. He is called so by Ibn Elkouthiya p. 438, and p. 439, Ibn Abi Okba Ibn Nafi Elfihri; he is also known to Tabari by that name; he is called by El-Makkari, p. 283, and by Casiri, Vol. II, p. 323, Ibn Abi Obeida Ibn Okba Ibn Nafi Elfihri, and by others Ibn Abda. This last name is evidently a corruption of the word Obeida, the diphthong being left out in the middle of the word and the O being changed into A at the beginning. El-Makkari and Casiri have merely added the name of the grand-father to that of the father, and Tabari has confounded the one with the other.

Habib first came to Spain in the suite of Musa Ibn Nosseyr. and was, according to Casiri *), appointed colleague of Abd Elaziz in the government of that country. He was afterwards commissioned by the Khalif Suleyman to assassinate Abd Elaziz, and was one of those who brought his head to the East. He fell in battle during the insurrection of the Berbers in the year 123.

18. Abd Elaziz Ibn Musa was the governor of Andalus from the year 95 to the year 97. According to Ibn Abd El-Hakem, he married the daughter of king Roderic; and according to Nuweiri **) and El-Makkari ***), his widow. She is called by the Spanish Chroniclers Egilone, and by some Arabic writers ايلة, Ibn Elkouthiya p. 430 designates her by the name of ام عاصم Umm Aâsim. When the town of Merida was taken by the Arabs, Egilone became Musa's slave, and ere she could have been lawfully married to Abd Elaziz, she must have become nominally at least a convert to Islamsm. El-Makkari says, that Abd Elaziz was put to death by the army.

Slane ****) remarks that, according to Ibn Abd El-Hakem, Abd Elaziz married the sister of king Roderic. This is evi-

*) Bibliotheca Arabico-Hispana Escurialensis, Vol. II, 323.
**) Hist. des Berb. Appendix, II, p. 534.
***) Gayangos Vol. II, p. 30.
****) Hist. des Berb. Vol. I, p. 354, Note 3.

dently a mistake on the part of Slane; for, in page 27 and page ١١ of this treatise, Ibn Abd Elaziz's wife is not only said to be the daughter of king Roderic, but is also represented as having herself called the latter her father. Fournel p. 69 again follows Slane in this case, and is consequently guilty of the same blunder as the latter has committed.

It appears to us almost unconceivable how so accomplished an Arabic Scholar as Slane should have perused the work of Ibn Abd El-Hakem with so much carelessness as the present instance especially, and others which are referred to in our notes, afford us so many proofs.

19. Abd Allah Ibn Musa was left behind as the governor of Ifrikiya, on the departure of his father Musa for the East; and he continued as the viceroy of that country until he was deposed in the year 96. according to p. 119 of Ewald's ms. Nevertheless he seems to have been the governor of the district in the year 97: according to p. 118, for it is there said that Abd Allah was the governor of Cairwan at the time when the head of his brother Abd Elaziz was brought by the Agents of the Khalif to the East. We know for certain, from Ibn Abd El-Hakem as well as from other sources, that the death of Ibn Abd Elaziz occurred in the year 97. Our author then in assigning two dates 96, 97, to the administration of Abd Allah, must have consulted two different traditions, and without thinking of their discrepancy, have written both in his history.

Abd Allah was put to death by Beshr Ibn Safwan who became governor of Ifrikiya in the year 102; see Ewald's ms. p. 121.

20. Musa Ibn Nosseyr El-Mak. p. 297 says, „as to his ancestors there are various opinions; some authors make him the son of Nosseyr, son of Zeyd, of the tribe of Beshr; others of Nosseyr son of Abd Errahman, son of Zeyd of the same tribe. Ibn Khallekan following El-Homaydi and other ancient historians calls him Musa Ibn Nosseyr a freedman of the tribe of Lakhm. Some go so far as to say he was a Berber of mixed blood.“

El-Makkari p. 297 says that upon the year of Musa's death there is but one opinion. Some authors, however, place that

event in the year 99, others in the year 98*), but the greatest number in the year 97. If then we believe with the best authorities, that Musa was present when the head of Abd Elaziz was brought to the Khalif, we must suppose that the murder of the son took place at the beginning of the year 97, and the death of the father occurred towards the close of that year. And corroborative of the truth of this supposition is the statement which has generally been received concerning the duration of Abd Elaziz government, viz. that of two years. We know for certain, from Ibn Abd El-Hakem, when Abd Elaziz first became viceroy of Andalus; for Musa's 'departure from that country is said to have been in the second month of the year 95. See p. 25 of this treatise.

21. The fine which Musa was condemned to pay is variously given. Gayangos Appendix IXXXVII of Vol. I, gives a transcript of the sentence issued against Musa; where it is said that the latter was to pay into the hands of Suleyman, or of his collectors, the sum of four millions and thirty thousand gold dinars, of good weight.

22. Yezid Ibn Muhallab, having distinguished himself for his bravery, was made governor of Chorasan. Having afterwards made war against Abd Errahman, he was deposed; which event took place during the reign of the Khalif Abd Elmalik. On the accession of Suleyman to power, Yezid was reinstated as the governor of Chorasan; but, after he had embarked in the expedition against Djordan, was again deposed, called into account, and put in prison. He defeated the troops of the governor Adij and had the latter imprisoned. He declared war against the Omaiyad and spread the insurrection through Persia; and finally he fell in battle against Maslama. See on the history of Yezid Weil Geschichte der Chalifen, Vol. I.

23. ومكث اهل الندلس بقد ذلك سنين This statement of Abd El-Hakem is corroborated by the testimony of Ibn Elkouthiya (p. 440), who says that Andalus, after the murder of Abd Elaziz, was for several years without a governor; but, that Aiyub Ellakhmi, a nephew of Musa, was, in consideration of his being

*) See Conde Histoire de la Dominatio des Arabes, en Espagne t. I, p. 116.

a sister's son of that illustrious general, elected by the Berbers to govern the country.

24. Mohammed Ibn Yezid. Ibn Elkouthiya p. 440 in saying that Suleyman appointed Abd Allah Ibn Yezid to the government of Ifrikiya in the place of Musa Ibn Nosseyr, has evidently confounded the names of two persons, who successively ruled over that province. These were Abd Allah Ibn Musa and Mohammed Ibn Yezid, the first being the governor of Ifrikiya from the year 95 to the 96 or 97, (for both dates are given by Abd El-Hakem), the second from the year 97 to the year 99, when on the death of Suleyman he was deposed. Cardonne*) has committed the same mistake in regard to these two governors of Ifrikiya.

Other Arabic authors, such as Nuweiri p. 357, assert that Mohammed Ibn Yezid was the viceroy of Ifrikiya on two different occasions: — once, as the successor of Abd Allah Ibn Musa, at which time he remained two years in authority. He was again elected to the administration of the province when the people were dissatisfied with the conduct of Yezid Ibn Abi Moslem.

25. Isma'il Ibn Abd Allah was appointed governor of Ifrikiya in the year 100, as Ibn Abd El-Hakem**) says, and not in the year 101, as Slane***) represents him as saying. He is not called Ibn Obeid Allah by Ibn Abd El-Hakem as Slane maintains, but Ibn Abd Allah. By this latter name he is also known to Nuweiri. Ibn Elkouthiya does not mention him nor Yezid Ibn Abi Moslem, his successor as viceroy of Ifrikiya.

26. خراج وصدقات****) The first word denotes an impost raised on the produce of the earth, the second a tax levied on moveables. Other words are used by Arabic writers to denote taxes of a peculiar kind, but these are not mentioned in the above passage.

27. Omar Ibn Abd Elaziz succeeded Suleyman Ibn Abd

*) Geschichte von Africa und Spanien, übersetzt von Murr, Bd. I.
**) Ewald's ms. p. 119; and page ١٣ of this treatise.
***) Hist. des Berb. Vol. I, p. 356.
****) Nouv. Journal Asiatique, Ser. 3, p. 249.

Elmalik in the Khalifate. On his accession to power he appointed Isma'il Ibn Abd Allah to the administration of Ifrikiya, and Assamah Ibn Malik to the goverment of Andalus. The latter after introducing many improvements into the administration of the country, fell in battle against the Franks in the year 102 or 103 *); and was for a short time succeeded as viceroy of Andalus by Abd Errahman Ibn Abd Allah, though Anbasa Ibn Soheym was at the same time a candidate for the same post.

28. Abû'l Harith El-Leyth Ibn Sâd was a Traditionist of great repute. He was born A. H. 92 (A. D. 731—2), and died in Old Cairo A. H. 175 (A. D. 791). See Slane's translation of Ibn Khallikan Vol. I, p. 544.

29. Yezid Ibn Abi Moslem. Tabari differs from Ibn Abd El-Hakem both as to the cause of Yezid's murder, and as to his successor in the administration of Ifrikiya. He says: in this year (102) Yezid Ibn Abi Moslem was assassinated in Africa because he would dismiss his former lifeguards, who were originally from Sawad, and compel them to pay taxes, as if they still continued in unbelief. They then appointed Mohammed Ibn Yezid as their governor for the second time, and his nomination was approved of by the Khalif **). The assassins of Yezid, according to Ibn Khaldun ***), belonged to the sect Chawaridj.

30. I. Yusuf Hajjaj. His history is fully given in Weil Geschichte der Chalifen, Vol. I.

31. البتر البرانس. El-Botr and El-Beranes are the two tribes into which the Berber nation was originally divided. Et-Botr is the plural of El-Abter. The word in the singular is used by Arabic writers as the surname of Madghis, and in the plural to denote his posterity. El-Beranes is the name of the Berber tribe which derived its origin from Bernes. Madghis

*) Lembke, p. 280 note 3. cf. Aschbach Geschichte der Omaiyaden, Vol. I, p. 56, and 57.

**) Cf. Nuweiri in Appendix II of Ibn Khaldun Hist. des Berb. Vol. I, p. 356.

***) Hist. des Berb. Vol. I, p. 216.

and Bernes were the sons of Berr, but whether these were the children of the one and the same father, or the offspring of two different persons bearing the same name, is a question on which Genealogists join issue. Arabic writers maintain the former of these opinions, and Berber authors the latter. These say that the Beranes were the children of Berr, a descendant of Mazigh, the son of Canaan; and that the Botr were the posterity of Berr the son of Cais, the grandson of Ghailan. See Ibn Khaldun Hist. les Berb. Tom. I, p. ١٠٧. واما شعوب هذا الجيد وبطونهم فان علماء النسب متفقون على انهم يجمعهم جذمان عظيمان وهما برنس ومادغس ويلقب مادغس الابتر فلذلك يقال لشعوبه البتر ويقال لشعوب برنس البرانس وهما معا ابنا بر وبين النسابين خلاف هل هما لاب واحد ۞

Weil*) not having consulted Ibn Khaldun, has committed two mistakes in the interpretation of these names.

1. He alters the text and reads instead of El-Botr Et-Tibr or Et-Tabr, which is a branch of the Berber tribes whose particular history is not investigated.

2. He understands by the Beranes or Beranos those who wore the Burnus, and who inhabited that part of the country which lies between Sus, Aghmat and Fez.

The contrast which is made in the text between the two tribes, and which is essential to the right understanding of the passage, is lost in Weil's interpretation. Besides, the custom of wearing the Burnus, according to Ibn Khaldun**), was common to all the Berber tribes, and not the peculiarity of a particular class.

On the later feuds which broke out between the El-Botr and the El-Beranes in Spain, see an extract from the work of Ibn Haiyan translated by De Gayangos***).

---

*) Geschichte der Chalifen, Vol. I, p. 607.

**) Hist. des Berb. Vol. I, p. 168 »Leurs habillements et presque tous leurs autres effets sont en laine, Ils s'enveloppment de vêtements rayes dont ils rejettent un des bouts sur l'paule gauche, et par dessus tout, ils laissent flottes des burnous noirs.«

***) El-Makkari, Vol. II, p. 449.

32. Mohammed Ibn Aus Elanzari. Cf El-Makkari, Vol. II, p. 9.

33. Beshr Ibn Safwan Elkelbi was the viceroy of Egypt previous to his appointment to the administration of Ifrikiya in the year 102. According to Nuweiri *), Beshr was made governor of Ifrikiya in the year 103, his predecessor Yezid Ibn Abi Moslem having first acceded to power in the year 102.

But Ibn Abd El-Hakem being a native of Egypt may be supposed to be better acquainted than Nuweiri, with the history of the governors of that country; and the date which he assigns to the commencement of Beshr's dominion in Ifrikiya is, for that reason, to be preferred.

34. وولا على الاندلس عنبسة ابن سحيم الكلبى وعزل الجرّ ابن عبد الرحمن العبسى The difficulties which this passage presents are of two kinds, the first referring to the date of the accession of Anbasa to power, and the second to the name of his immediate predecessor.

Weil **) following Ibn Abd El-Hakem thinks that Anbasa first became the governor of Andalus under the Khalifate of Hisham who ascended the throne in the year 105. Weil further supposes that some authors have assigned an earlier date to Anbasa's administration, being misled by the prominent part which he played as general of the army during the government of his predecessor Assamah. We have in this case to decide between the single testimony of Ibn Abd El-Hakem and the unanimous opinion expressed by other trustworthy writers. We prefer the latter for the following reasons.

1. Ibn Abd El-Hakem furnishes us with no information on the history of Anbasa's immediate predecessors: for the space of eight years, — from the year 97 to the year 105, he makes no reference to the administration of Andalus. But we can only hope to obtain correct results in determining the date of Anbasa's accession to power, when we take into account the history of the preceding period. This is only given by those writers whose testimony is at variance with that of Ibn Abd El-Hakem on the point in question.

*) Hist. des Berb. Vol. I, p. 357.

**) Geschichte der Chalifen, Vol I, p. 612.

2. The statement, which is made in the text regarding the administration of Anbasa, is utterly irreconcilable with the dates which are unanimously assigned to the accession of his predecessors to power. He, who adopts Ibn Abd El-Hakem's date, should also show that it is not inconsistent with the chronology followed by other authors in reference to the governments of the viceroys of Andalus from the year 97 to the year 105. This task is the more difficult, as Ibn Abd El-Hakem does not mention even the names of two of Anbasa's predecessors; though there can be no doubt that they were governors for some time. Besides, the administration of Assamah is said to have commenced in the year 100; for his appointment to office is associated, by Ibn El-kouthiya and other authors, with the accession of Omar to the Khalifate: and we know for certain that, according to all documents, his death occurred not later than the year 103. and most authors say, that he fell in battle in the year 102. We also know that his successor Abd Errahman ruled over Andalus for six months. After that he was deposed and then succeeded by Anbasa. This was, according to all the authorities, except Ibn Abd El-Hakem, in the year 103. And we obtain the same results as to the date of Anbasa's government, whether we follow the traditions regarding the duration of the administration of each of his predecessors, or whether we reckon the time according to the year in which each is said to have received his appointment. We arrive by all these methods at the same conclusion, viz. that Anbasa was appointed the governor of Andalus in the year 103.

To reconcile the two traditions on the date of Anbasa's government seems impossible, to account for the origin of their discrepancy is difficult. Ibn Abd El-Hakem and the other authorities do not seem to have followed the same chronology from the year 97 to the year 105; for, p. ١٣ of this treatise the former says that Andalus, after the death of Abd Elaziz, was two years' time without a governor appointed by the Khalif. This viceroy was Elhorr Ibn Abd Errahman; whose accession to power, according to the above words, could not have been earlier than the year 99. But this date is at variance

with the unanimous testimony of the best authorities, and tends to reduce the chronology of this period into one mass of confusion.

It is, however, probable that Anbasa received his appointment from Beshr Ibn Safwan. This was some time after the arrival of the latter in Ifrikiya, but not after his return to that province in the year 105, as Ibn Abd El-Hakem seems to intimate.

2. The name of Anbasa's immediate predecessor is in the above passage the other difficulty which requires to be solved. Ibn Abd El-Hakem and Nuweiri *) assert that Anbasa succeeded Elhorr Ibn Abd Errahman in the administration of Andalus, the other authorities say that Abd Errahman was at that time the governor of the country. How are these statements to be reconciled? Weil (p. 612) endeavours to solve the difficulty, by supposing that Elhorr was governor of Spain on two different occasions. This supposition is, however, wholly gratuitous, for it is not supported by the least historical evidence: and it seems also to have been made with the sole view of meeting a difficulty. Ibn Abd El-Hakem and Nuweiri appear to us, in the present instance, to have confounded the name of Elhorr Ibn Abd-Errahman with that of Abd-Errahman, for the latter was, according to the unanimous testimony of the other documents, the immediate predecessor of Anbasa as the governor of Spain. The best sources of the history of this period are not wanting in instances of a similar confusion in reference to the names of other governors, especially when these names bear any degree of resemblance to each other. We have already cited a parallel case in note 24 of this treatise; we have there seen that Ibn Elkouthiya represents the two governors Abd Allah Ibn Musa and Mohammed Ibn Yezid as one person; he jumbles the names of these two viceroys, and forming a new appellation calls the successor of Musa Ibn Nosseyr in the administration of Ifrikiya, by the name of Abd Allah Ibn Yezid. Another instance of a similar confusion of the names of two different persons, is mentioned in the follow-

*) Hist. des Berb. Vol. I, p. 357.

ing note. It is then not improbable that Ibn Abd El-Hakem and Nuweiri have committed a similar mistake in the present instance; being led into this error by the resemblance in the two names they have confounded. It may further be remarked that much of the obscurity resting over this period of Spanish history is owing to this cause*).

35. Ubeida Ibn Abd Errahman Elkeisi was the governor of Ifrikiya from the year 110 to the year 115. He is called Essolami by Nuweiri**) and El-Makkari***). According to Ibn Khaldun, Ubeida returned to the East in the year 114, leaving Ocba Ibn Kudama in the command of Ifrikiya. This continued in authority till the year 116, when he was deposed and then succeeded by Ubeid Allah Ibn El-Habhab. Ibn Elkouthiya (p. 442) makes the latter succeed Beshr Ibn Safwan in the goverment of Ifrikiya, and represents his administration as having lasted from the year 110 to the year 123. This is again a mistake on the part of Ibn Elkouthiya, and it evidently arose from the similarity of the two names Ubeida and Ubeid — two persons, of whom, the one succeeded the other in the administration of Ifrikiya.

36. Elmustanir or Elmustatir Ibn Elharith. Silence is observed by other authors regarding the expedition of Elmustanir into Sicily, nor do they even mention his name.

37. Abd Errahman Ibn Abd Allah. The year of his accession to power in Andalus, for the second time, is not given by Ibn Abd El-Hakem. Ibn Haiyan, an extract from whose work is quoted by Elmakkari ****), says, that this took place „in Safar of the year 113, and that he was appointed by Ibnu'l-hajab, Wali of Eastern Africa.“

The Arabic sources furnish very imperfect information on the history of Spain from the administration of Anbasa to the accession of Abd Errahman to power, for the second time. Indeed there

---

*) Aschbach, Geschichte der West-Gothen, p. 318 n. 17, confounds Tarik with Tarif.

**) Hist. des Berb. Vol. I, p. 350.

***) De Gayangos Vol. II, p. 36.

****) Vol. II, p. 33.

is the greatest uncertainty prevailing as to the time of Anbasa's death or removal from office: and the history of his immediate successors in authority is also enveloped in obscurity; Ibn Elkouthiya p. 443 mentions their names without giving the dates of their respective administrations. On the place as well as the time in which Abd Errahman fell in battle, see Lembke p. 288, Fournel p. 72, Aschbach Geschichte der Omaiyaden, p. 70—1, Reinaud Invas. des sarras. p. 45, et seq. Most writers assign to this battle an earlier date of one year than that which is given to it by Ibn Abd El-Hakem. This is Ramadhan of the year 114 A. H.

38. Abd Elmalik Ibn Katan was sent to Andalus to revenge the death of Abd Errahman. According to Elmakkari*) and Lembke 289, he was appointed to the government of Spain, in Ramadhan of the year 114; but they evidently reckon from the death of Abd Errahman, without taking into consideration that a few months must have elapsed between that event and the entrance of Abd Elmalik upon his office. This took place in the year 115; and he continued in authority, until the accession of Ubeid Allah to power in the province of Ifrikiya. He was then deposed, and succeeded by Okba Ibn El-Hajjaj. This was in the year 116.

39. Ubeid Allah Ibn Elhabhab was the governor of Ifrikiya from the year 116 to the year 123. Ibn Khaldun**) places the arrival of Ubeid Allah in Ifrikiya in the year 114. The same author as well as Nuweiri***) dates the insurrection of the Berbers from the year 122, and not from the year 123; but the latter is the correct date of that event, according to Ibn Abd El-Hakem. Ibn Elkouthiya p. 442 says that Ubeid Allah was, in consequence of the defeat of the Arabs, deposed by the Khalif Hisham Ibn Abd Elmalik, who sent Kolthum Ibn Iyadh into Africa, charging him at the same time to chastise and exterminate the whole Berber nation.

40. Okba Ibn El-Hajjaj. Authors differ as to the duration

---

*) Vol. II, p. 37.

**) Hist. de l'Afr. sous la dynast. des Aghlab. p. 33.

***) Hist. des Berb. Vol. p. 369.

of Okba's government as well as to the cause and the manner of his death*). Ibn Elkouthiya says merely, that the insurrection in Andalus was caused by the party of Abd Elmalik, and that Okba was in consequence thereof deposed. As the Berbers were instigated to this insurrection by hearing of the success of the revolt of their countrymen in Ifrikiya, it is not probable that Okba was deposed before the year 123. This, we have seen in the preceding note, is the correct date of the first insurrection of the Berbers in Ifrikiya.

The word هلك is generally used to denote a violent kind of death, but is not applied to the death of a person who dies on a sick-bed or who falls in a holy war. It is, however, employed p. ٢١, to denote the death of which Kolthum died. He fell in a civil insurrection.

41. Meisara or Masira Elfakir („the ignoble") was a Berber of the tribe Badghar; this is called Madghar by Nuweiri**) and Ibn Khaldun. Ibn Elkouthiya p. 443 represents him as having taken a part in the battle which was fought against Kolthum; but, according to Nuweiri p. 360, he was deposed, previous to the battle in which so many of the Arabic nobles lost their lives. Having revolted in Tangiers, he proclaimed the sovereignty of the chief of the Sofariy, — Abd El-Ala Ibn Hodeidj El-Ifriki, a man of Christian origin, but who had become a convert to Islamism. Meisara invited the people to embrace the doctrines of the Chawaridji-Sofariy. The Berbers being at last tired of his tyranny, put him to death***).

42. Kolthum Ibn Iyadh Elkeisi — a member of the tribe Keis: according to Nuweiri****) and Ibn Khaldun, he was a Koscheiri. He became the governor of Ifrikiya in Ramadhan of the year 123; and continued in authority only a few months. Another tradition says that Kolthum was put to death in the year 124. Hence some authors assert that he fell in the first battle in which he was engaged with the Berbers; and others that it was the second in which he was killed. In Ibn El-

*) See Lembke Geschichte von Spanien, p. 293, n. 4.

**) Hist. des Berb. Vol. I. p. 360 and 218.

***) Ibn Khaldun Hist. des Berb. Vol. I, p. 217.

****) Hist. des Berb. t. I, p. 360.

kouthiya's *) the place where the batttle was fought, is designated by the name of Nafdoura نفدورة. In Ibn Khàldun's **) it is called Seboua: and the last named author says that Meisara was the commander of the Berbers in that battle; but in other passages of his work ***), he speaks of Chalid Ibn Humeid as the general of the insurgents on that occasion. Fournel, p. 78. 79, attributes this to the inconsistency of Ibn Khaldun, and he further maintains that Chalid Ibn Humeid was then the leader of the Berbers and not Meisara. Fournel evidently did not know that Ibn Abd El-Hakem (p. 37) expressly says that Kolthum was killed by Meisara, and that Ibn Elkouthiya (p. 443) asserts that the Berbers then fought under the banners of Humeid Ezzenati and of Meisara the „ignoble“.

43. Tripolis. It is called طرابلس الغرب by Abulfeda ****), in order to distinguish it from Tripolis in Syria. The same author further says, Tripolis is a city on the sea shore, built on the rocks, it has a large revenue, and is well fortified, it is surrounded by very ancient and elegant, though not very strong ramparts. Edrisii Africa, edit Hartmann, p. 293.

44. Maslama Ibn Sawada of the tribe Koreish was appointed by Kolthum to be the commander of the army; but the management was properly entrusted to Abd Errahman Elghifari.

45. Cabes, Greek *Καπη*, Latin Tecape, a maritime town of Ifrikiya situated on the frontiers of the province of Tripolis. It was once, according to Abulfeda *****) the capital of Ifrikiya as Damascus was the capital of Syria. Edrisii Africa edit. Hartmann, p. 262.

46. Zenata. See note 2 of this treatise. This tribe was famous for its zeal and devotedness to the interest of the Moslems, ever since the conversion of Magrowwa to Islamism. It

---

*) Journal Asiatique, ser. 5, tom. 8, p 443.

**) Hist. des Berb. t. I, p. 238. Hist. de l'Afr. sous la dynast, des Aghlab. p. 37.

***) Hist. des Berb. Appendix, t. I, p. 217. Hist. de l'Afrique sous la dynast. des Aghlab. p. 35.

****) Geographie Aboulfeda en Arabe par Schier, p. ٣٩.

*****) Geographic d'Aboulfeda traduite de l'Arabe par Reinaud, t. II, p. 198.

once rendered a special service to Okba Ibn Nafi, by rescuing him from a dangerous position, into which he had been betrayed, on his first inroad into Ifrikiya *).

„Les Zenata etaient originairement des Arabes de race pure, mais, par suite des alliances quils ont contractees avec les Masmondis leurs voisins ils sont devenus eux-memes Berbers **).“

47. Sebiba. Nuweiri reads Ceuta, which is evidently wrong. Ibn Haucal ***) says, the distance from Cairwan to Djohunetein is one day's journey, and the same distance from tha latter place to Sebiba.

48. Chalid Ibn Humeid Ezzenati succeeded Meisara as the leader of the Berbers in the insurrection of the latter against the Arabs. Ibn Abd El-Hakem p. 35 is alone of the opinion that Abd Elmalik was also present at the disturbances of the Berbers in Africa, and elected their chief, on the death of Meisara. Nevertheless Chalid is p. 36 represented as the governor of the Berbers. These different traditions of Ibn Abd El-Hakem can only be reconciled, by supposing that Ibn Abd Elmalik, soon after his election in Ifrikiya, returned to Andalus, of which country he became governor, on the death of Ubeid Allah Ibn Habbab ****).

49. Balj Ibn Beshr. Ibn Elkouthiya *****) says, that Balj having applied to Abd Elmalik for aid, was refused, the latter having first consulted the *Sheiks* of his council, and fearing, should Balj be allowed to land in Spain, he would dispute his claims to the administration of the country. Nevertheless Balj and the Syrians in his suite embarked for Andalus in marchant vessels, and landed in Algisiras. Abd Elmalik being informed of this, marched out to meet his adversary, but in the battle which ensued he was defeated; and Balj rode on triumphantly to Cordova where he was duly proclaimed as the governor of the country: this honour, however, he was destined

*) Hist. les Berb. t. I, p. 346.

**) Geographie d'Edrisi, traduite de l'Arabe par Jaubert, t. I, p. 234.

***) Nouv. Journal Asiatique, Ser. 3, tom. 13, p. 214.

****) Weil Geschichte der Chalifen, Vol. I, p. 641, Journal Asiatique, ser. III, t. 12, p. 445.

*****) Journal Asiatique, Ser. 5, Tom. 8, p. 444.

to enjoy only for a short time; though there are not wanting authorities*) who represent his administration as having lasted a year or so. According to El-Makkari, Balj being invited by Abd Elmalik to enter Spain, in order to assist him to quell the insurrection of the Berbers, refused to leave the country at the termination of the war. Conde says that Balj joined the Spanish Berbers against Abd Elmalik, but this is, according to Lembke**), highly improbable.

50. Abd Errahman Ibn Habib, whose name occurs in some authors as follows: Abd Errahman Ibn Habib Ibn Abi Ubeida Ibn Okba Ibn Nafi Elfihri. The original sources do not agree as to the Abd Errahman who killed Balj: Ibn Abd El-Hakem and the authors consulted by Conde say that he was Abd Errahman Ibn Habib; Ibn Khaldun, Ibn Haiyan, and El-Makkari***) assert that he was Abd Errahman Ibn Elkama; according to Ibn Elkouthiya p. 445, he was Abd Errahman Ibn Okba, the then governor of Narbonne. Elmakkari p. 43 says, that the two Abd Errahman — Abd Errahman Ibn Habib and Abd Errahman Ibn Elkama El-lakhmi were present at the battle in which Balj was mortally wounded; and he further remarks that Abd Errahman Ibn Elkama was then the governor of Narbonne. It is probable that Abd Errahman Ibn Elkama and Abd Errahman Ibn Okba are one and the same person, or one has been confounded with the other in the present case; for both are said to be the governor of Narbonne at the time, and Ibn Okba is also said by Ibn Elkouthiya to be of the tribe Lakhm. Neither of the two, however, seems to us to be the Abd Errahman who put Balj to death****).

51. Omaiya Ibn Abd Elmalik. Many authors assert that two sons of Abd Elmalik exerted themselves to revenge their father's death: — namely Omaiya and Katan. But this is probably a mistake, arising from the fact of Abd Elmalik being

*) El-Makkari translated by De Gayangos, Vol. II, p. 41.

**) Geschichte von Spanien, p. 297 n. 1.

***) Vol. II. p. 44.

****) See further Weil Geschichte der Chalifen, Vol. I, p. 651. De Gayangos' Vol. II, p. 412, note 13.

called Ibn Katan. Hence some writers have reversed the order of the names, and have spoken of Katan Ibn Abd Elmalik.

This is an instance of confusion occasioned by another cause than that which is mentioned in note 34 of this treatise.

52. Kadi of Andalus. Of the office of Kadi, see El-Makkari translated by De Gayangos, Vol. I, p. 104.

53. ثُمَّ افترق اهل الاندلس على اربعة امرآ. This is to be understood of the parties which contended for the supreme authority at this time in Spain. The Syrians who came over to the country in the suite of Balj and Thalaba were called شاميون, in order to distinguish them from those who were already in Andalus, and came after the conquest or soon after it: these were called بلديون the inhabitants of the country.

54. Thalaba Ibn Salama Eljudami is represented by several historians*), as having succeeded Balj in the government of Spain. He is probably included under the four governors, between whom, according to Ibn Abd El-Hakem, Andalus was divided after the death of Balj. Isidorus Pacencis makes no mention of Thalaba among the governors of Spain. Ibn Khaldun says that he governed Andalus for a period of two years; although his authority was not acknowledged for more than ten months.

55. Han'tala Ibn Safwan being the viceroy of Egypt, was appointed the governor of Ifrikiya in the year 124. Having been successful in quelling the insurrection of the Berbers in that province, and in killing their two leaders Ukasha and Abd Elwahid; he was forced by one of his own people to give up his authority, and retire to the East. He is said to have yielded quietly to his fate, offering his rival Abd Errahman no resistance; because he was averse to a civil insurrection. This being the case, how improbable is the account which Nuweiri**) gives of the conduct of Han'tala on this occasion: — namely, that he cursed the land, the inhabitants of which had shown themselves so ungrateful towards him, and which was in consequence of his curse, visited by pestilence.

---

*) El-Makkari translated by De Gayangos, Vol, II, p. 44.

**) Hist. des Berb. t. I, p. 365.

56. Tunis is a town of great antiquity in Eastern Africa. To the ancients it was known by the name of ترشيش, which is also written ترسيس; the latter is evidently a corruption of the former word, arising from the points of the ش and ت being left out, and the latter being produced above the line. The town received the name of Tunis, when the Moslems built a new wall around it*).

57. Asnam is said by Nuweiri**) to be 3 miles distant from Cairwan; it lies on the route to Djeloula. The word signifies idols.

58. Karn is a hill situated in the vicinity of Djeloula.

Nuweiri and Ibn Khaldun***) quoting from Elleyth Ibn Sâd, remark that the battle of El-Karn and El-Asnam was the most dreadful one that was fought since the battle of Bedr. The latter is the name of the place where Mohammed obtained his first victory.

59. Sofariy were the followers of Ziyad Ibn Alasfar according to Sherastani****); others make them the adherents of Abd Allah Ibn Safar. According to Kamus they were a branch of the Haruriy. That they considered it lawful to make prisoners of the women is mentioned by Ibn Abd El-Hakem as a peculiarity of this sect, and by Ibn Elkouthiya as a doctrine which all the different sects of the Chawaridji held in common.

60. Nafzawa is one of the tribes into which the Berbers were divided, and consisted of several families; such as the Ghassasa, Zehila, Soumata. These were the descendants of Itoufelt Ibn Nafzaw. The father of this tribe, according to Ibn Khaldun, did not belong originally to the Berber race, but was, on the contrary, a member of the Arabic tribe Yemen; in his youth having been accidentally found by Itoufelt, he was adopted by him. — This tribe professed the doctrines of the Ibadhiy*****).

*) Edrisii Africa edit. Hartmann p. 265.

**) Hist. des Berb. t. I, p. 363.

***) Hist. des Berb. t. I, p. 218.

****) Sherastani edited by Cureton, p. ١٠٤; and Scherastani übersetzt von Haarbrücker, p. 154.

*****) Ibn Khaldun Hist. les Berb. t. I, p. 227, 230.

61. Ibadhiy are one of the six sects of the Chawaradji. They were the desciples of Abd Allah Ibn Ibadh, who rebelled in the days of Merwan Ibn Mohammed. They did not call their Imam امير المومنين, nor themselves the مهاجرون (followers of Mohammed to Medina). See further on the peculiar tenets of this sect Sherastani edited by Cureton, p. ١٠٠; and Scherastani übersetzt von Haarbrücker, p. 151 — 53.

Chawardji is the name of the religious Arabic sect, which in the days of Mohammed's associates or in later times, revolted against the Imam as established by law, and as acknowledged by the community. Many of the Arabs were so disgusted with the disputes of Ali, the son-in-law of Mohammed and his rival Muawia, about the Khalifate, that they rejected the claims of both parties, and pronounced the Imam to be elected by the univeral suffrage of the Moslems, for the future.

The Chawaridji were divided into six chief sects, all of which agreed, to renounce the authority both of Othman and of Ali, and to regard the condemnation of these Khalifs as a most important dogma in their creed. Further, whenever they entertained the opinion that the Imam deviated from the sacred laws, they maintained it to be their duty to protest against it. In Africa the labours of this sect to propagate its doctrines, were crowned with immense success: for almost the whole Berber nation professed the tenets of the Chawardji*).

62. Howwara, according to Ibn Khaldun, was a branch of the Berber tribe Beranes, and which derived its name and origin from Howwara Ibn Aurigh, Ibn Bernes. At the time of the conquest of Ifrikiya by the Moslems, all the Berber tribes were designated by the general name of Howwara: both those who drew their origin from Elabter, and those who claimed Bernes as their ancestor: they then inhabited the province of Tripolis, and a part of the adjoining district, Barca. Some of them had fixed habitations while others led a nomadic life.

*) See Sherastani edited by Cureton, Part. I, p. ٨٥; Hist. des Berb. traduite par De Slane, t. I, p. 203. Cf. also Steinshneider Aufsatz, Zeitschrift der D. M. Gesellschaft, Band IV, p. 145; Hammer Purgstall, Wiener Jahrbücher, 1843, Bd. 101, p. 5, 6; Haarbrücker, Uebersetzung von Scherastani p. 377 — 80.

In the general insurrection of the Berbers, this tribe especially distinguished itself: and was otherwise known by its attachment to the doctrines of the Chawaridji, and belonged to that particular sect called the Ibadhiy*).

63. Abd Errahman Ibn Habib was the last governor of Ifrikiya under the dynasty of the Umaiyad, and the first under that of the Abbacides. He conducted the administration of Ifrikiya from the year 127 to the year 137 of the Hidjra. According to Ibn Khaldun, p. 219, it was Abd Errahman that killed Abd Eljabbar and El-Harith in the year 131. A. H. (748—9, A. D.); and Nuweiri, p. 366 says, that Abd Errahman finding the two leaders of the Berbers apart from each other, defeated them successively.

64. Sahra. This word signifies properly a plain, and is used to denote the great desert.

65. Ismail Ibn Zeiyad is said by Ibn Khaldun**) to have made himself tha master of Cabes in the year 132 A. H., when the Abbacides acceded to power. He was one of the distinguished persons who belonged to the tribe of Nefousa.

66. Surt A town situated on the gulph of the Syrtes major, on the side of Cyrene.

---

*) See Ibn Khaldun Hist. des Berb. traduite par de Slane, t. I, p. 273, 272.

**) Hist. des Berb. t. I, p. 227.

Corrections and Additions.

P. 6, l. 31 for se read etc.
— 9, l. 2 read present for preseat.
— l. 9 read freely for frely
— 17, l. 15 read varied for variated.
— l. 17 read affairs for afairs.
— 20, l. 4 read his for hls.
— 23, l. 33 read for the man his foot
— 26, l. 13 for »all that be brought with him read the fifth part of all that he brought to thee.
— 27, l. 21 for o Muadsin read to his Muadsin.
— 32, l. 13 read Elwabila for Elwabita.
— l. 26 read expedition for expedion.
— 34, l. 2, 3 read Ubeid Allah for Abd Allah.
— 35, l. 6 for Abd Allah read Ubeid Allah.
— 37, l. 30 after the name Katan add saying.
— 40, l. 10 for Abd Elwahid read Elfuzari.
— 42, l. 1 for suit read suite.
— l. 2 for 126 read 127.
— l. 17 read after the name Masgud who was killed.
— 46, l. 25 for 33 read 31.
'note' for ٧١ read ١٠٧

A table of the Abbreviations which are used in the preceding pages.

قال	=	قا
حدثنا	=	ثنا
عبد الملك	=	ع. م.
عبد الملك بن محمد	=	ع. م. ب. م.
اخْبرنا	=	اـــنا
عبد الله	=	م. ا.
عبد الرحمن	=	م. ا.

حتى اذا كان بقابس[1]) قدم ابن عمه شُعيب بن عثمن فى خيل فلقى اسماعيل فقتل اسماعيل واصحابه واسر من البربر اسارى كثيرةً وكان ع. ر. مقيمًا فى عسكره ولم يشهد الوقعة فنهض حين فتح له الى سوق اطرابلس ومعه الاسارى وكتب الى عمرو بن عثمن فقدم عليه من ارض سُرت66) وقدم الاسارى فضرب اعناقهم وصلبهم واستعمل على ارض اطرابلس عمرو بن سويد المرادى وامره ان ينقل آخر الجزو الخامس (من فتوح)[2]) مصر

1) C. 2 reads بفاس for بقابس.
2) The words من فتوح are left out in C. 2.

تليد الحضرمى فحاصروا حميد بن ع. ا. فى بعض قرا اطرابلس ووقع الوبا فى اصحابه فخرج بعهد وامان فلما خرجوا اخذ عبد الجبار بن قيس فصير بن راشد مولى الانصار فقتله وكان من اصحاب حميد وكانوا يطلبونه بدم عبد الله بن مسعود المقتول واستولى عبد الجبار على زناته واوضها فكتب ع. ر. بن حبيب الى يزيد بن صفوان المعافرى بولاية اطرابلس ووجّه مجاهد بن مسلم الهوّارى يستالف الناس ويقطع عن عبد الجبار هوّاره وغيرهم فاقام مجاهد فى هوّاره اشهرًا ثم طردوه فلحق بيزيد بن صفوان باطرابلس فوجّه ع. ر. بن حبيب بمحمد بن مفروق وكتب الى يزيد بن صفوان بالخروج معه فخرجوا فلقيهم عبد الجبار بن قيس والحارث بن تليد بما كان من ارض هوّاره 62) فقتل يزيد بن صفوان ومحمد بن مفروق وانهزم مجاهد بن مسلم الى ارض هوّاره فقفل ع. ر. بن حبيب 63) واجتمع اليه جمع كثير فزحف بهم الى عبد الجبار والحارث ابن تليد فلقيهم بارض زناته فانهزم عمرو بن عثمن واصحابه واستولى عبد الجبار والحارث على اطرابلس كلها ثم خرج عمرو بن عثمن الى دغوغا ومعه مجاهد بن مسلم واتبعه الحارث بن تليد فوجه عمرو من نغوغا الى ارض الصحرا 64) فادركه الحارث فتقدم عمرو الى سرت فادركته خيل الحارث فقتلوا نفرا [1]) من اصحابه ونجا عمرو على فرسه جريحا واحتوى [2]) الحارث على عسكره واستفحل امر عبد الجبار والحارث ثم اختلف امرهما وتفاقم ما بينهما فاقتتلا فقتل عبد الجبار والحارث جميعا فولى البربر على انفسهم اسماعيل بن زياد 65) النفوسى فعظم شانه وكثر بيعه فخرج اليه ع. ر. بن حبيب

1) C. 1 reads فتقدم عسرا for فقتلوا نفرا; the latter is correct.
2) C. 2 reads وادنوا for واحتوى.

سلامة الجذامى مع حنظلة فلما بلغ من بافريقية من اهل الشام قتل
الوليد بن يزيد خرج عامة قوادهم وخرج ثعلبة بن سلامة الى المشرق
وكان قتل الوليد كما ثنا ع. ر. قا كما ثنا يحيى بن بكير عن الليث
فى يوم الخميس لثلاث ليال بقين من جمادى الاخرة سنة ست وعشرين
ومائة فخرج ع. ر. بن حبيب بتونس وجمع لقتال حنظلة بن صفوان
واخراجه من افريقية فلما بلغ ذلك حنظلة ارسل وجوه افريقية الى ع. ر.
يدعوه الى الدعة والكف عن الفتنة فساروا فلما كانوا ببعض الطريق
تلقتهم ولاية مروان بن محمد فارادوا الانصراف وبلغ ع. ر. ان حنظلة
ارسل اليه رسلا وكانوا خمسين رجلا وانهم يريدون الانصراف فارسل اليهم
خيلا فاصرفتهم اليه ووجه ع. ر. عليهم لخروجهم اليه وكانوا قد كاتبوه قبل
ذلك سرا من حنظلة فلما بلغتهم ولاية مروان نزعوا عن ذلك فبعث
بهم الى تونس فى الحديد وكتب ع. ر. الى حنظلة ان يخلى له القيروان
وان يخرج منها واجله ثلثة ايام وكتب الى صاحب بيت المال الا
يعطيه دينارا ولا درهما الا ما حل له من ارزاقه 1) فلما قرا حنظلة الكتاب
هم بقتاله ثم حجزه عنه الورع وكان ورعا فخرج بمن خف معه من اصحابه
من اهل الشام وذلك فى جمادى الاولى سنة سبع وعشرين ومائة ودخل
ع. ر. بن حبيب القيروان فى جمادى الاخرة سنة ست وعشرين ثم بعث
ع. ر. اخاه بن حبيب عملا على اطرابلس فاخذ ع. ا. بن مسعود التجيبى
وكان اباضيا قاضيا ورئيسا فيهم فضرب عنقه واجتمعت الاباضية (61
باطرابلس فعزل ع. ر. اخاه وولى حميد بن ع. ا. العكى وكان على
الاباضية حين اجتمعت عبد الجبار بن قيس المرادى ومعه الحارث بن

1) C. 1 reads اوراقه for ارزاقه.

الواحد عند[1]) الاصنام[57]) بجموعه وزحف حنظلة الى الفزارى لقُربـه منه وخرج معه باهل القيروان فخرج قوم ايسين من الحياة للذى كانوا يتخوفونه من سبى الذرارى وذهاب النسآ والاموال وجعل عليهم محمد ابن عمرو بن عُقبة فلقيهم بالاصنام فهزّم الله عبد الواحد وجمعه وقتل ومن معه قتلا ما يدرا ما هو وهرب من هرب منهم فلما فتح الله لحنظلة عاجل الفزارى من ليلته فقاتله بالقرن[58]) ولم يكن بلغ عكاشة هزيمة عبد الواحد فهزمه الله ومن معه من اصحابه وهرب ُعكاشة حتى انتهى الى بعض نواحى افريقية فاخذه قوم من البربر اسيرا حتى اتوا به الى حنظلة فقتله وكان عبد الواحد ومن معه صفريه[59]) يستحلون سبى النسآ وكان قتل عكاشة وعبد الواحد كما نا ع. ر. قا كما نا يحيى بن بكير من الليث سنة خمس وعشرين ومائة وقد كان حنظلة عند ما كان من حلول عبد الواحد بالاصنام وعكاشة بالقرن وقربيا[2]) من القيروان كتب الى معاوية بن صفوان عامله على اطرابلس يامره بالخروج اليه باهل اطرابلس فخرج حتى انتهى الى قابس فبلغه ما كان من هزيمة عبد الواحد وعكاشة فكتب اليه حنظلة فى بربر خرجوا بنفزاواه[60]) وسبوا اهل ذمتها[3]) فامض اليهم فسار اليهم بمن معه فقاتلهم فقُتل معاوية بن صفوان وقتل الصفريه واستنقذ ما[4]) كان فى ايديهم مما اصابوا من اهل الذمة فبعث حنظلة الى جيش معاوية ذلك زيد بن عمرو الكلبى فانصرف بهم الى طرابلس وكان ع. ر. بن حبيب بقابس وكان ثعلبة بن

1) عند is left out in C. 1.
2) C. 1 reads وقرنا for قربيا.
3) C. 2 adds here the words فامض اليهم.
4) C. 1 reads here ما كانوا اصابوا and omits the rest of the sentence.

الغفارى الى عُكاشه بن ايوب الفزارى وقد جمع جمعا عظيما[1]) بعد انهزامه من قابس فلقيه من معه فانهزم الفُزارى وقتل عامة اصحابه ثم جمع ايضا فلقيه ع. ر. بن عقبه فهزمه ثم جمع جمعا اخر وقدم عبد الواحد بن يزيد الهوارى ثم التدهمى وكان صفريا مجامعا للفزارى على قتال حنظلة بن صفوان فخرج اليهما ع. ر. بن عقبه فى اهل افريقيه فقتل ع. ر. بن عقبه واصحابه وكان مقتل ع. ر. بن عقبه كما دنا يحيى بن بكير عن الليث فى سنة اربع وعشرين ومائة ثم مضا عبد الواحد بن يزيد فاخذ تونس56) فاستولى عليها وسلم عليه بالخلافة ثم تقدم الى القيروان وانتبذ الفُزارى بعسكره ناحيةً وكلاهما يريد القيروان يتبادران[2]) اليها ايهما يسبق صاحبه فيغنم فلما راى حنظلة ما غشيهم من جموع البربر مع الفزارى وعبد الواحد احتفر على القيروان خندقاً وزحف اليهم عبد الواحد وكتب الى حنظلة يامره ان يخلى له القيروان ومن فيه فاسقط فى ايديهم وظنوا انهم سيُسبوا حتى ان كان حنظلة ليبعث الرسول معهم ليأتيه بالخبر فما يخرج الى مسيرة ثلثة اميال الا بخمسين دينارا فلما غشيه عبد الوحد فكان من القيروان على تنبيه بمرحله بمكان يقال له الاصنام ونزل الفُزارى من القيروان على ستة اميال وكان مع عبد الواحد ابو قرة العقيلى وكان على مقدمته فكتب حنظلة الى الفزارى كتابا يرثيه فيه ويهيبه[3]) رجا الا يجتمعا عليه فلا يقوى عليهما وخاف اجتماعهما وكان عُكاشة اقرب الى حنظلة فصبح عبد

1) عظيما seems to have been left out in C. 2.

2) C. 1 reads وابتدا الفزارى بعسكره instead of يتبادران اليها.

3) C. 2 reads يمنيه for يهيبه

فقاتله بلج فانهزم ع. ر. بن حبيب ثم جمع جمعا اخر فقتل بلج ومن معه ويقال ان بلج لم يقتل انما مات موتا ثنا ع. ر. قا ثنا يحيى بن بكير عن الليث قال مات بلج فى سنة خمس وعشرين وماية بعد قتله ابن قطن بشهر ثم افترق اهل الاندلس على اربعة امرآ[53]) حتى ارسل اليهم حنظلة بن صفوان الكلبى بابن الخطاب الكلبى فجمعهم وسانكر ذلك فى موضعه ان شآ الله تعالى وقد كان كلثوم بن عياض كتب الى عامله على اطرابلس صفوان ابن ابى مالك يستمده فخرج اليه باهل اطرابلس حتى قدم اليه [1]) قابس فانتهى اليه خبر كلثوم ومن معه فانصرف وقد كان خرج الى سعيد بن بجرة ومن تحصّن معه من اصحاب مسلمة ابن سوادة الجُذامى وتنجا الفُزارى الى نهر يقال له الجمة على اثنى عشر ميلا من قابس فلما رجع صفوان ابن ابى مالك تحصّن سعيد بن بجرة واصحابه بقابس وخرج ع. ر. بن عُقبة الغفارى فى اهل القيروان الى الفُزارى فلقيه فيما بين قابس وبين القيروان فانهزم الفزارى وقتل عامة اصحابه ثم وجّه هشام بن ع. م. حنظلة بن صفوان فى صفر سنة اربع وعشرين وماية وكان عامله على مصر فلما قدم افريقيه كتب اليه اهل الاندلس واهل الشام وغيرهم يسلونه ان يبعث اليهم والّيا فبعث ابا الخطاب فلما قدمها ادوا اليه الطاعة فوليها ودانت له وفرق جمع بلج ابن بشر وع. ر. بن حبيب واخرج ثعلبة بن سلامة[54]) فى سفينة الى افريقيه ثم اخرج بعده ع. ر. بن حبيب واخرج مع [2]) ثعلبة اهل الشام فكانوا بالقيروان مع حنظلة ثم ان حنظلة بن صفوان[55]) اخرج ع. ر. بنُ عقبة

---

1) The word اليه is left out in C. 1.

2) C. 1 reads معه for مع; the latter is preferable.

الناس الى افريقية وكان قتل كلثوم فى سنة ثلث وعشرين ومااية نما ع. ر.
قا نما يحيى بن بكير عن الليث بن سعد قال قتل كلثوم فى سنة اربع
وعشرين ومااية قتله ميسرة وانهزم بلخ بن بشر وثعلبة الجُدامى وبقية
اهل الشام الى الاندلس فاتبعهم ابو يوسف الهوارى وكان طاغية من
طواغى البربر فادركهم فقاتلهم فقتل ابو يوسف وانهزم اصحابه ومضى بلخ
وثعلبه الى الاندلس وكان كلثوم قد كتب الى اهل الاندلس وعليها عبد
الملك بن قطن الفهرى يامرهم بامداده والخروج اليه فوافاهم بلخ وقد
وقعوا الى مجاز الخضرآ وتقدم عبد الرحمن ابن حبيب امام بلخ الى
الاندلس فقدمها وامر ع. م. ابن قطن الا يسمع لبلخ ولا يطيعه ثم
قدم بلخ فاقام بالجزيرة وكتب الى ع. م. بن قطن انه خليفة كلثوم وشهد
له بذلك ثعلبة الجُدامى واصحابه وكان الرسول فيما بينهم قاضى الاندلس
فسلم ع. م. بن قطن الولاية لبلخ على كُرْهٍ من ع. ر. بن حبيب فخرج
ع. ر. من قرطبه كارهًا لولاية بلخ ثم ان بلخا لما قدم قرطبه حبس ع. م.
بن قطن فى السجن وثار ع. ر. بن حبيب[50]) ومعه امية ابن ع. م.[51])
ابن قطن فجمعا لقتال بلخ فاخرج بلخ ع. م. بن قطن من السجن وقال
له قم فى المسجد واخبر الناس ان كلثوم كتب اليك انى خليفته فقام
ع. م. فقال ايها الناس انى والى كلثوم وانى محبوس بغير حق فضرب بلج
عنقه ثم قدم ع. ر. بن حبيب بجموع فخرج اليه بلج ومن معه من اهل
الشام وكان بينهم نهر فلما كان الليل عبر ع. ر. الى قرطبه وخليفة بلج
بها القاضى[52]) وقد كان القاضى اتهم بدم ع. م. بن قطن فاخذه ع. ر.
ابن حبيب فسمل عينيه وقطع يديه ورجليه وضرب عنقه وصلبه على
شاجرة وجعل على جثته راس خنزير وبلج لا يشعر ثم خرج من قرطبه

ثم رحلا [1]) جميعا بمن معهما الى طنجة وكان كلثوم حين خرج الى البربر قد قدم بلج ابن بشر على مقدمته فى الخيل فلما قدم على حبيب رفضه واهان منزلته ثم قدم كلثوم فتلقاه حبيب فتهاون به ايضا ثم خطب كلثوم الناس على دس [2]) بان له فطعن فى حبيب وشتمه واهل بيته وكان ع. ر. بن حبيب مع ابيه حبيب ثم تقدم [3]) كلثوم [4]) فلما انتهى الى مطلوبه من ارض طنجة تلقته البربر بجموعهم وعليهم خالد ابن حميد الزناتى 48) ثم الهتورى عراة متجردين ليس عليهم الا السراويلات وكانوا صفريه وجاوا جردين فشار حبيب بن ابى عبيدة على كلثوم ان يقاتلهم الرجالة بالرجالة والخيل بالخيل فقال له كلثوم ما اغنانا عن رايك يا بن حبيب فوجه بلج بن بشر 49) على الخيل ليدوسهم بها وكانت الخيل اوثق فى نفس كلثوم من الرجالة وان بلجا اسرى ليلته حتى واقفهم عند الصبح واستقبلوه عراة متجردين فحملت عليهم الخيل فصاحوا وولّوا ورموا بالاوصاف فانهزم بلج جريحاً وتساقطت الخيول على الكلثوم وقد تاهب وعبّا [5]) اصحابه فارسل الى حبيب ابن ابى عبيدة فقال ان امير المومنين امرنى ان اوليك القتال واعقد لك على الناس فقال حبيب قد فات الامر وزحفت رجّالة البربر على اثر الخيل حتى خالطوا كلثوم واصحابه فاقسم حبيب على ابنه ع. ر. ان لا ينزل راجلا وان يلزم بلجا فيكون معه اسفا على بلج فانى [6]) مقتول وهلك كلثوم وحبيب ومن معهما وانهزم

1) C. 1 reads دخلا instead of رحلا.
2) له is left out in C. 1.
3) C. 1 reads نفد for تقدم.
4) C. 1 adds وحبيب.
5) C. 1 reads وعيث instead of وعبّا.
6) C. 1 reads فان for فانى.

او قد دُس للفتنة فقطع يده ورجله فكان مقيما بتلمسين فى جيشه وقفل[1] عبيد الله بن الحجاب الى هشام بن عبد الملك وذلك فى جمادى الاولى من سنة ثلث وعشرين وماية ثم وجّه هشام على افريقية كُلثوم ابن عياض القيسى[42] فى جمادى الاخرة سنة ثلث وعشرين ومائة وقدم بلج ابن بشر امامه فلما قدم كلثوم افريقية امر اهل افريقية بالجهاد والخروج معه الى البربر وقطع على اهل اطرابلس[43] بعثا فخرج فى عدد كثير واستخلف على القيروان ع. ر. بن عُقبة الغفارى وعلى الحرب مسلمة بن سوادة القرشى[44] فثار عليه بعد خروج كلثوم بريد[2] طنجة عكوشة ابن ايوب الفزارى من ناحية قابس[45] وهو صُفرى وارسل اخًا له فقدم سبره فجمع بها زناته[46] وحضر اهل سوق سبره فى مساجدهم وعليهم حبيب بن ميمون وبلغ الخبر صفوان بن ابى مالك وهو امير اطرابلس فخرج بهم فوقع على اخى الفزارى وهو محاصر اهل سبره فقاتلهم فانهزم الفزارى وقتل اصحابه من زناته وغيرهم وهرب الى اخيه بقابس وخرج مسلمة بن سوادة فى اهل القيروان الى عكاشة ابن ايوب بقابس فقاتلهم فانهزم مسلمة وقتل جماعة من خرج معه ولحق بالقيروان وتحصّن عامة من كان مع مسلمة من اهل القيروان وعليهم سعد بن بحيرة الغسّانى ويقال ان كلثوم بن عياض حين قدم من عند هشام خلف خلف القيروان ولم ينزل به ولم يدخله ونزل سبيبة[3] وهى من مدينة قيروان على يوم[47] فافطر فيها وكتب الى حبيب بن ابى عبيدة الا يفارق عسكره حتى يقدم عليه ثم شخص كلثوم غازيا حتى قدم على حبيب

1) C. 1 reads وفقد for وقفل.
2) C. 1 reads بربر before طنجة.
3) C. 1 reads شيبة for سبيبة.

ثم انصرف وانتقضت البربر على عبيد الله بن الحبحاب بطنجه فقتلوا
عامله عمر بن عبد الله المرادى وكان الذى تولى ذلك ميسرة[1] الفقير (41
البربرى ثم البدعرى والذى قام بامر البربر وادعا الخلافة وتسمى بها
وبويع عليها ثم استعمل ميسرة على طنجه عبد الاعلا ابن خديج الافريقى
وكان اصله روميا وهو مولى لابن نصير ثم سار الى السوس وعليها اسماعيل
ابن عبيد الله فقتله وذلك اول فتنة البربر بافريقيه فوجّه عبيد الله بن
الحبحاب خالد بن ابى حبيب الفهرى الى البربر بطنجه ومعه وجوه اهل
افريقيه من قريش والانصار وغيرهم فقتل خالد واصحابه لم ينجُ منهم
احد فسميت تلك الغزوة غزوة الاشراف ويقال ان خالد لقى ميسرة
دون طنجه فقتل ومن معه ثم انصرف ميسرة الى طنجه فانكرت عليه
البربر سيرته وانه تغير عن ما كانوا بايعوه عليه فقتلوه وولوا امرهم عبد
الملك بن قطن المحارى[2] ثنا ع. ر. قا ثنا يحيى بن بكير عن الليث
ابن سعد قال كان بين ميسرة الفقير واهل افريقيه من البربر وقتل
اسماعيل ابن عبيد الله وخالد بن ابى حبيب فى سنة ثلث وعشرين
فوجه اليهم ابن الحبحاب حبيب ابن ابى عبيدة فلما بلغ تلمسين اخذ
موسى ابن ابى خالد مولى لمعاوية بن خديج وكان على تلمسين وقد
اجتمع اليه من تمسك بالطاعة فاتهمه حبيب ان يكون له هوى[3]

---

1) C. 1 reads مسيرة for ميسرة; the latter method of spelling the word is the more commonly followed by other authors. Cf. Ibn Elkouthiya in Journal Asiatique, Ser. 5, t. 8, p. 442.

2) C. 1 reads الحارى for المحارى; Abd Elmalik is commonly called Elfihri. Cf. p. ٢٣ of this treatise.

3) C. 1 reads هوا for هوى; the latter is correct.

الملك بن قطن[38]) ثم خرج عبيدة[1]) الى هشام بن عبد الملك وخرج معه
فى هدايا وذلك فى شهر رمضان سنة اربع عشرة ومایة نا ع. ر. قا نا يحيى
بن بكير عن الليث بن سعد قال كان قدوم عبيدة بن ع. ر. من افريقية
سنة خمس عشرة ومایة وفيها امّر ابن قطن على الاندلس وكان فيما
خرج به العبيد والامآ ومن الجوار المتخيرة سبع مایة جارية وغير ذلك
من الخصيان والخيل والدوا والذهب والفضة والآنية واستخلف على
افريقيه حين خرج عقبة ابن قُدَامة التجيبى فقدم على هشام بهداياه
واستعفاه فاعفاه[2]) وكتب الى عبيد الله بن الحبحاب[39]) وهو عامله على
مصر يامره بالمسير على افريقيه وولاه اياها وذلك فى شهر ربيع الاخر من سنة
ست عشرة ومایة فقدم عُبيد الله بن الحبحاب افريقيه فاخرج المستنير
من السجن وولاه تونس واستعمل ابنه اسماعيل ابن عبيد الله على
السوس واستخلف ابنه القاسم بن عبيد الله على مصر واستعمل على
الاندلس عقبة بن الحجاج[40]) وعزل عبد الملك بن قطن ويقال بل كان
الوالى على الاندلس يوميذ عنبسة بن سحيم الكلبى فعزله ابن الحبحاب
وولّا عقبة بن الحجاج فهلك عقبة بن الحجاج بالاندلس فرد عبيد الله
عليها عبد الملك بن قطن وغزا عبد الله بن حبيب بن ابى عبيدة
الفهرى السوس وارض السودان فظفر بهم ظفراً لم ير مثله واصاب ما شآ
من ذهب وكان فيما اصاب جارية او جاريتان من جنس تسميه البربر
أُجان[3]) ليس لكل واحدة منهن الا ثَدْىٌ وَاحدٌ ثم غزا[4]) ايضا البحر

---

1) These words are not in C. 1.
2) C. 1 reads فعفاه instead of اعفاه; the latter is preferable.
3) C. 1 reads اجاز for أُجان.
4) C. 1 reads غزاه for غزا.

الليث قال وولى عبيدة بن ع. ر. افريقية فى محرم[1] سنة عشر ومائة)[2]
فلما قدم عبيدة افريقية وجه المستنير[3]) بن الحارث[4]) الحرشى[36]) غازيا
الى صقلية[5]) فاصابتهم ريح فغرقتهم ووقع المركب الذى كان فيه المستنير
الى ساحل اطرابلس فكتب عبيدة ابن ع. ر. الى عامله على اطرابلس يزيد
ابن مسلم الكندى يامره ان يشده وثاقا ويبعث معه ثقة فبعث به فى
وثاق فلما قدم على عبيدة جلده جلدا وجيعا وطاف به القيروان
على اتان ثم جعل يضربه فى كل جُمعة مرة[6]) حتى اذا بلغ اليه وذلك
ان المستنير اقام بارض الروم حتى نزل عليه الشتا واشتدت امواج البحر
وعواصفه فلم يزل محبوسًا عنده وكان عبيدة قد ولا عبد الرحمن ابن
ع. ا. العكى[37]) على الاندلس وكان رجلا صالحا فغزا ع. ر. افرنجة وهم اقاصى
عدو الاندلس فغنم غنايم كثيرة وظفر بهم وكان فيما اصاب رجْلاً من
ذهب مفصصة بالدر والياقوت والزبرجد فامر بها فكسرت ثم اخرج الخمس
وقسم ساير ذلك فى المسلمين الذين كانوا معه فبلغ ذلك عبيدة فغضب
غضبا شديدا فكتب اليه كتابا يتواعده فيه فكتب اليه ع. ر. ان السموات
والارض لو كانتا رتقًا لجعل الرحمن للمتقين منهما مخرجًا ثم خرج اليهم ايضا
غازيا فاستشهد وعامة اصحابه فكان قتله كما دما ع. ر. قا كما دما يحيى عن
الليث فى سنة خمس عشرة ومائة فولى عبيدة (على الاندلس بعده عبد

1) Ewald's 'ms. reads البحر; but no Arabic month is so designated: we have therefore altered the text. البحر may, however, be the same as يوم النحر *the 10th of Dulh'ijj'eh.*

2) This passage commencing with the word دما is left out in C. 2.

3) C. 2 reads مستنر for مستنير.

4) C. 2 reads الحرث for الحارث; the latter is the usual method of spelling the word.

5) C. 1 reads سقلية for صقلية.

6) The particle اذا is better left out as in C. 1.

بعافيته بعد ان قتله في ذلك اليوم وبعث براسه مع سليمان بن وعلة التميمي الى يزيد فنصبه ثم وفد بشر بن صفوان الى يزيد بهدايا كان اعدها له حتى اذا كان ببعض الطريق لقيته وفاة يزيد وكانت وفاته كما ثنا ع. ر. قا كما ثنا يحيى بن بكير عن الليث بن سعد ليلة الجمعة لاربع ليال بقين من شعبان سنة خمس ومائة وقدم بشر بتلك الهدايا على هشام بن ع. م. فردّه على افريقيه فقدمها وتتبع اموال موسى بـ. ن. وعذّب عُماله وولا على الاندلس عنبسه بن سحيم الكلبي وعزل عنها الحرّ[1]) ابن عبد الرحمن[34]) العبسي[2]) وقد كان بشر غزا البحر من افريقيه فاصابهم الهول فهلك لذاك من جيشه خلق كثير ثم توفي بشر بن صفوان من مرض يقال له الوبيلة[3]) في شوال سنة تسع ومائة ثنا ع. ر. قا ثنا يحيى بن بكير عن الليث بن سعد قال نزع بشر بن صفوان على افريقيه في سنة خمس ومائة ورد اليها في سنة ست ومائة ومات في سنة تسع ومائة واستخلف بشر بن صفوان حين توفي على افريقيه بعاس بن قرط الكلبي فعزله هشام وولا عبيدة بن عبد الرحمن القيسي[35]) على افريقيه في صفر سنة عشر ومائة ثنا ع. ر. قا ثنا يحيى بن ع. ا. بن بكير عن

1) الحجر is in Ewald's ms., but this name is generally written with ح and not with ج.

2) العبسي, Weil p. 612 conjectures that Ibn Abd El-Hakem has here confounded the word Elabsi with the word Elthakifi, Elthakif being the name by which El-Horr's tribe is usually designated. We rather think that Elabsi has been mistaken for Elakki or Elghafeki, the latter being the name employed to denote a member of the tribe to which Abd Errahman belonged. Cf. note 34 of this treatise.

3) C. 1 reads الوبيل for الوبيلة.

امرهم وكتب الى يزيد يخبره بما كان فبعث فى ذلك خالد بن ابى عمران
وهو من اهل تونس فقدم على يزيد فقبل منه وعفا عمّا كان من زلتهم
قال خالد بن ابى عمران ودعانى يزيد خاليا فقال اى رجل محمد بن
اوس فقلت رجل من اهل الدين والفضل معروف بالفقه قال فما كان بها
قرشى قلت بلى المغيرة ابن ابى بردة قال قد عرفته فما له لم يبق قلت
ابا ذلك واحبّ العزلة فسكت واتّهم الناس عبد الله ابن موسى ب. ذ. ان
يكون هو الذى عمل فى قتل يزيد بن ابى مسلم فوجه يزيد بن ع. م.
بشر ابن صفوان[33] الكلبى افريقيه وذلك فى ثنتين ومائة وكان عامله على
مصر فخرج الى افريقيه واستخلف على مصر اخاه حنظلة فلما دخل
افريقيه بلغه ان ع. ا. بن موسى هو الذى دس لقتل يزيد بن ابى
مسلم وشهد على ذلك خالد بن ابن حبيب القرشى وغيره فكتب
بشر الى يزيد بن ع. م. فكتب يزيد الى بشر بن صفوان يامره بقتل ع. ا.
ابن موسى ب. ذ. وتم بشر بتاخيره اياما فقال خالد بن ابى حبيب ومحمد
ابن ابى بكير لبشر بن صفوان عجل بقتله من قبل ان تاتيه عافيته من
اميرالمومنين وكانت ام ع. ا. بن[1] موسى ب. ذ. تحت ربيع صاحب خاتم
يزيد فكلم يزيد فامر بعافيته وجعلت اخته للرسول ثلثة الاف دينار
ان هو ادركه وامر بشر بقتل ع. ا. بن موسى فقتل وقدم الرسول

„sea"; and El-Makkari (History of the Mohammedan dynasties in Spain; translated by de Gayangos), Vol. II, p. 9 quoting this passage of Ibn Abd El-Hakem, follows the former reading.

1) C. 1 reads بنت instead of بن, the former word referring to ام: this is evidently incorrect; for the lady would thus be the mother and the sister of Abd Allah at the same time.

ابى مسلم أُتى فى اخر طعامه بعنب فتناول منه عُنقوداً واهوى اليه رجل من حرسه يقال له جرير بالسيف فضربه حتى قتله واحتز راسه ورمى به فى المسجد عتمه فاقبل غلام لمحمد بن يزيد فدخل عليه السجن فقال ابشر فان يزيد قد قتل قال له محمد كذبت وظن انه دُس اليه ثم اتبعه اخر من غلمانه ثم اخر حتى توافوا سبعة فلما تيقن محمد بموت يزيد اعتق العبيد قال ويقال بل كان حرس يزيد بن ابى مسلم حين قدم البربر ليس فيهم الا بترى وكانوا هم حرس الولاة قبله البتر خاصة ليس فيهم من البرانس[31]) احد فخطب يزيد بن ابى مسلم الناس فقال انى[1]) ان اصبحت صالحاً وشمت حرسى فى ايديهم كما تصنع الروم فاشم فى يد الرجل اليمنى اسمه وفى اليسرى حرسى فيعرفوا بذلك من غيرهم فانفوا من ذلك ودبّ بعضهم الى بعض فى قتله وخرج من ليلته الى المسجد لصلاة المغرب فقتلوه فى مُصَلّاه وكان قتله كما نا ع. ر. قا كما نا يحيى بن بكير عن الليث بن سعد فى سنة ثنتين ومائة فلما قتل يزيد بن ابى مسلم اجتمع الناس فنظروا فى رجل يقوم بامرهم الى ان ياتى راى يزيد ابن ع. م فتراضوا بالمغيرة ابن ابى بُردة القرشى ثم احد بنى عبد الدار فقال له عبد الله ابنه ايها الشيخ ان هذا الرجل قتل بحضرتك فان تمت بهذا الامر بعده لم آمن عليك ان يلزمك امير المومنين قتله فقبل[2]) ذلك الشيخ فاجتمع راى اهل افريقيه على محمد ابن اوس[32]) الانصارى وكان بتونس على غرو نحوها[3]) فارسلوا اليه فولوه

1) C. 2 reads انى for اخى, the latter reading is incorrect.

2) The text reads فقتل; but that word conveys not a proper meaning in this passage; we have therefore read فقبل. See Weil Geschichte der Chalifen, Vol. I, p. 607.

3) C. 1 reads بحرها for نحوها, the former word signifies

سبع وتسعين فلم يزل محمد بن يزيد واليًا حتى تُوفى سليمن بن ع. م. وكانت وفاته كما ثنا ع. ر. قا ثنا يحيى بن بكير عن الليث بن سعد يوم الجمعة لعشر ليالٍ بقين من صفر سنة تسع وتسعين فعزل وولى مكانه اسماعيل بن عبد الله[25] فى المحرم سنة ماية على حربها وخراجها وصدقاتها[26] وكان حسن السيرة ولم يبق فى ولايته يوميذ من البربر احد الا اسلم فلم يزل واليًا عليها حتى توفى عمر بن عبد العزيز[27] وكانت وفاته كما ثنا ع. ر. قا ثنا ابن بكير بن الليث بن سعد[28] يوم الجمعه لعشر ليالٍ بقين من رجب سنة احدى وماية فعُزل ووُلى مكانه يزيد بن ابى مسلم كاتب الحجاج ولاه يزيد بن ع. م. فى سنة احدى وماية وع. ا. بن موسى ب. ذ. يوميذ فى المشرق فقدم مع يزيد بن ابى مسلم[29] الى افريقيه حتى اذا كان قريبا منها تلقاه الناس فلما دخل القيروان عزم يزيد بن ابى مسلم على ع. ا. بن موسى بن ذ. ان ينصرف الى منزله فمضى ع. ا. الى داره وامر يزيد الناس باتباعه حتى ظنوا[1] انه شريك معه فلما ادبر ع. ا. الحقه يزيد رسولا بان أعدَّ من مالك عطآ الجند خمس سنين ثم أنّ يزيد بن ابى مسلم اخذ موالى موسى ب. ذ. من البربر فوشم ايديهم وجعلهم اخماسًا واحصى اموالهم واولادهم ثم جعلهم حرسه وبطانته واخذ محمد بن يزيد القرشى فعذبه وجلده جلدا وجيعا فاستسقاه فسقاه رمادا وكان محمد بن يزيد قد ولى عذاب يزيد بن ابى مسلم بالمشرق فى زمان الحجاج[30] فقال له يزيد اذا اصبحت عذبتك حتى تموت او اموت قبلك وكان قد بنا له فى السجن بيتًا ضيقا فجعله فيه وكساه جُبة صوف غليظة وطبع عليها بخاتم من رصاص فلما تعشا يزيد بن

1) C. 1 reads يظنوا for ظنوا.

حبيب ابن ابى عبيدة واصحابه واتبعه زياد بن النابغة فدخل على اثره فوجده تحت الشجرة فقال له عبد العزيز يا بن النابغة تجنى ولك ما سالت فقال له لاتذوق الحياة بعدها فاجهز عليه واحتز راسه وبلغ ذلك حبيبا واصحابه فرجعوا ثم خرجوا براس عبد العزيز الى سليمن بن ع. م. وامّروا على الاندلس ايوب ابن اخت موسى ب. ن. ومروا بقيروان وعليها ع. ا. بن موسى[19] ب. ن. فلم يعرض لهم وساروا حتى قدموا على سليمن براس عبد العزيز ب. م. فوضعوه بين يديه وحضر موسى ب. ن. فقال له سليمن اتعرف هذا قال نعم اعلمه صواما قواما فعليه لعنة الله ان كان الذى قتله خيرا منه وكان قتل عبد العزيز ب. م. كما نما ع. ر. قا كما نما يحيى بن ع. ا. بن بكير عن الليث بن سعد فى سنة سبع وتسعين قال وكان سليمن عاتبًا على موسى ب. ن.[20] فدفعه الى حبيب ابن ابى عبيدة واصحابه ليخرجوا به الى افريقيه فاستغاث بايوب بن سليمان فاجاره وشفع له الى ابيه ويقال ان سليمن اخذ موسى ب. ن. فغرم له ماية الف دينار[21] والزمه ذلك واخذ ما كان له فاستجار بيزيد بن[1] المهلب[22] فاستوهبه من سليمن فوهبه له ومالةّ ورد ذلك عليه ولم يلزمه شيا ومكث اهل الاندلس بعد ذلك سنين[23] لا يجمعهم والى وعزم سليمن على الحج فاخرج موسى ب. ن. على نصب حجزه فخرج حتى اذا كان المربد تُوفى وكانت وفاته فى سنة سبع وتسعين فيما نما ع. ر. قا ا-نا يحيى بن بكير عن الليث ابن سعد ثم ولّى افريقيه محمد بن يزيد[24] القرشى ولاه سليمن بن ع. م. بمشورة رجآ بن حيوة وصرف ع. ا. بن موسى سنة ست وتسعين نما ع. ر. قا نما ابن بكير عن الليث قال امّر محمد بن يزيد على افريقيه سنة

1) C. 1 reads بين بدى for بيزيد بن; the latter is correct.

هكذا اصبتها فاخرج طارق الرجل التى كان اخذ منها حين اصابها
فقال يستدل امير المومنين بها على صدق ما قلت له وانى اصبتها فصدقه
الوليد وقبل قوله واعظم جايزته ثم رجع الى حديث عثمن وغيره قال
وكان عبد العزيز بن موسى بعد خروج ابيه قد تزوج امراة نصرانية
بنت ملك من اهل الاندلس يقال لها ابنة لدريق ملك الاندلس الذى
قتله طارق فجآته من الدنيا بشى كثير لا يوصف فلما دخلت عليه
ت مالى لا ارى اهل مملكتك يعظمونك ولا يسجدون لك كما كان اهل
مملكتى ابى يعظمونه ويسجدون له فلم يدر ما يقول لها فامر بباب فنقب
فى ناحية قصره وكان[1] قصيرًا وكان ياذن للناس فيدخل الداخل اليه
من الباب حين يدخل منكسًا راسه لقصر الباب وهى فى موضع تنظر
الناس منه فلما رات ذلك قالت لعبد العزيز الان قومى[2] ملكك وبلغ
الناس انه انما نقب الباب لهذا وزعم بعض الناس انها نصّرته فثار به
حبيب ابن ابى عبيدة الفهرى وزياد بن النابغة التميمى واصحاب لهم
من قبايل العرب واجمعوا على قتل عبد العزيز الذى بلغهم من امره
واتوا الى مُوذّنه فقالوا له اذّن بليل لكى نخرج الى الصلوة فاذن الموذن
ثم ردّد التثويب فخرج عبد العزيز18) فقال لموذنه لقد عجّلت واذنت
بليل ثم توجه الى المسجد وقد اجتمع له اوليك النفر وغيرهم ممن حضر
الصلوة فتقدم عبد العزيز وافتتح يقرا اذا وقعت الواقعة ليس لوقعتها
كاذبةٌ خافضةٌ رافعةٌ فوضع حبيب السيف على راس عبد العزيز فانصرف
هاربا حتى دخل داره فدخل جنانًا له واختبا فيه تحت شجرة وهرب

---

1) C. 2 reads وجعله for وكان.
2) C. 1 adds الى which is here unnecessary.

موسى اليه وخرج موسى حتى اذا كان بطبرية اتته وفاة الوليد فقدم على سليمان بتلك الهدايا فسر سليمان بذلك ويقال ان موسى ب. ن. حين قدم من الاندلس لم ينزل القيروان خلفها ونزل قصر الما [1]) وضحا هنالك ثم شخص وشخص معه طارق دنا ع. ر. قا دنا يحيى بن بكير عن الليث بن سعد قال قفل موسى ب. ن. وافدًا الى امير المومنين في سنة ست وتسعين ودخل الفسطاط يوم الخميس لستّ ليالٍ بقين من ربيع الاول ثم رجع الى حديث عثمن وغيره قال فبينما سليمان يقبل تلك الهدايا اذ انبعث رجل من اصحاب موسى ب. ن. يقال له عيسى ابن ع. ا. الطويل من اهل المدينة وكان على الغنايم فقال يا امير المومنين ان الله قد اغناك بالحلال عن الحرام واني صاحب هذه المقاسم وان موسى لم يخرج خمسا من جميع ما اتاك به [2]) فغضب سليمان وقام من سريره فدخل منزله ثم خرج الى الناس فقال نعم قد اغناني الله بالحلال عن الحرام وامر بادخاله [3]) في بيت مال المسلمين وقد كان سليمان امر موسى ب. ن. برفع حوايجه وحوايج من معه ثم الانصراف الى المغرب قال ويقال بل قدم موسى ب. ن. على الوليد بن ع. م. والوليد مريض فاهدى اليه موسى المايدة فقال طارق انا اصبتها فكذبه موسى فقال للوليد فادع بالمايدة فانظر هل ذهب منها شي فدعا بها الوليد فنظر فاذا برجل من ارجلها لا يشبه الاخرى فقال له طارق سله يا امير المومنين فان اخبرك بما تستدل به على صدقه فهو صادق فساله الوليد عن الرجل فقال

---

1) C. 1 reads قصرًا لها for قصر الما.
2) C. 1 reads جميع المال نال به for جميع ما اتاك به.
3) C. 2 reads بادخال ذلك بيت instead of بادخاله في بيت.

عند الموت من الزفت من الزفت [1]) قال واخذ موسى ابن نصير طارق ابن عمرو وشده وثاقا وحبسه وهمّ بقتله وكان مغيث [2]) الرومى غلاما للوليد بن ع. م. فبعث اليه طارق انك ان رفعت امرى الى الوليد وان فتح الاندلس على يدىّ وان موسى حبسنى وانه يريد قتلى اعطيتك ماية عبد وعاهده على ذلك فلما اراد معتب الانصراف ودع موسى ابن نصير وقال له لاتعجل على طارق ولك [3]) اعداء وقد بلغ امير المومنين امره واخاف عليك وجده فانصرف معتب وموسى بالاندلس فلما قدم معتب على الوليد اخبره بالذى كان من فتح الاندلس على يدى طارق وحبس موسى اياه والذى اراد به من القتل فكتب الوليد الى موسى يقسم له [4]) بالله لين ضربته لاضربنك ولين قتلته لاقتلن ولدك به ووجه الكتاب مع معتب الرومى فقدم به على موسى الاندلس فلما قراه اطلق طارقا وخلى سبيله ووفا طارق لمعتب بالماية العبد التى كان جعل له وخرج موسى ب. ذ. من الاندلس بغنايمه وبالجوهر والمايدة واستخلف على الاندلس ابنه عبد العزيز بن موسى وكانت اقامة موسى بالاندلس سنة ثلث وتسعين واربع وتسعين وشهرا من سنة خمس وتسعين فلما قدم موسى افريقية كتب اليه الوليد ب. ع. م. بالخروج اليه فخرج واستخلف على افريقيه ابنه ع. ا. بن موسى وسار موسى بتلك الغنايم والهدايا حتى قدم مصر ومرض الوليد ب. ع. م. فكان يكتب الى موسى يستعجله ويكتب اليه سليمن بالمكث والمقام ليموت الوليد ويصيار ما مع

1) C. 1 reads الوقت instead of الزفت.

2) C. 1 reads معتب instead of مغيث; the latter is more correct. See p. ٤ note 1.

3) C. 1 reads وذلك for ولك; the latter is preferable.

4) له is left out in C. 1.

ويرمى[1]) بها الى الطريق ليتوهم من رآها انها ميتة فاذا خرج اخذها وان[2]) كان الرجل ينزع نصل سيفه فيطرحه ويملا الجفن غلولا ويضع قايمة السيف[3]) على الجفن فلما ركبوا السفن وتوجهوا سمعوا مناديا ينادى اللهم غرق بهم فتقلدوا المصاحف فغرقوا جميعا الا ابو عبد الرحمن الحبلى وحنش ابن عبد الله السنانى فانهما لم يكونا ندديا من الغلول بشى دما ع. ن قا دما ع. م. ب. م. قا دما ابن لهيعة قال سمعت ابا الاسود قال سمعت عمرو بن اوس يقول بعثنى موسى بن نصير افتش اصحاب عطآ ابن رافع مولى هذيل حين انكسرت مراكبهم فكنت ربما وجدت الانسان قد خبا الدنانير فى خرقة فى شى بين حصيتيه قال فمر بى انسان متكيا على قصبه فذهبت افتشه فنازعنى[4]) فغضبت فاخذت القصبة فضربته بها فانكسرت وانتثرت الدنانير منه فاخذت اجمعها دما ع. ر. قا دما ع. م. قا دما الليث بن سعد قال بلغنى ان رجلا فى غزوة عطآ ابن رافع وغيزه بالمغرب غل فتحمل بها حتى جعلها فى زفت[5]) فكان يصيح

---

for the preposition م is more commonly used in Arabic with verbs of filling than the preposition ب.

1) C. 1 adds عليه.

2) C. 2 reads وكان instead of وان كان, the latter is preferable; as it corresponds to the phrases which have been used to express the cases of plunder mentioned in the preceding page.

3) C. 2 reads قايم السيف, the first word conveys not a proper meaning in this passage, the second is right. C. 1 reads قايمة السدف, the first word is right, the second is wrong; we have therefore in this case chosen the second word found in C. 2 and the first in C. 1.

4) C. 2 reads فبان عنى instead of فنازعنى, the latter is more correct in this connexion.

5) C. 1 reads وفت for زفت.

يحيى ابن سعيد قال لما انفتحت الاندلس اصاب الناس فيها غنايم فغلوا فيها غلولا كثيرًا جعلوه[1] فى المراكب وركبوا فيها فلما توسطوا البحر سمعوا مناديا يقول اللهم غرق بهم فدعوا الله وتقلدوا المصاحف قال فما نسُوا ان اصابتهم ريح عاصف وضربت المراكب بعضها بعضا حتى تكسرت وغرق بهم واهل مصر ينكرون ذلك ويقولون ان اهل الاندلس ليس هم الذين غرقوا وانما هم اهل سردانية وذلك ان اهل سردانية كما ىما ع. ر. قا كما ىىا سعيد بن غفير قال لما توجه اليهم المسلمون عمدوا الى مينا لهم فى البحر فسدوه واخرجوا منه المآ ثم قذفوا فيه آنيتهم من الذهب والفضة ثم ردوا عليه المآ بحاله وعمدوا الى كنيسة لهم فجعلوا لها سقفا من دون سقفها وجعلوا ما كان لهم من مال بين السقفين فنزل رجل من المسلمين يغتسل فى ذلك الموضع الذى سدوه[2] ثم اعادوا المآ عليه فوقعت رجله على شى فاخرجه فاذا صحفة من فضة ثم غاص ايضا فاخرج شيا اخر فلما علم المسلمون بذلك حبسوا عنه المآ واخذوا جميع تلك الآنية ودخل رجل من المسلمين ومعهُ قوس بُندق الى تلك الكنيسة التى رفعوا بين سقفيها مالهم فنظر الى حمام فرماه ببندقة فاخطاه واصاب سجة خشب فكسرها وانهال عليهم المال فغل المسلمون يوميذ غلولا كثيرا فان كان الرجل لياخذ الهرّ فيذبحها فيرمى بما[3] فى جوفها ثم يحشوه ىما[4]) غل ثم يخيط عليه

1) C. 1 reads حملوه for جعلوه.

2) The ms. reads شكنزوه, but this word conveys no meaning in this passage, we have therefore altered the text and read سدوه.

3) C. 1 reads بها for بما.

4) C. 1 reads بما instead of ىما, the latter is more correct;

مقتلة قط اكثر منها فلم يرفع المسلمون السيف عنهم ثلثة ايام ثم ارتحل الناس الى قرطبة قال ويقال ان موسى هو الذى وجه طارق بعد مدخله الاندلس الى طليطلة وهى النصف فيما بين قرطبة واربونه واربونة اقصى ثغر الاندلس وكان كتاب عمر ابن عبد العزيز ينتهى الى اربونة ثم غلب عليها اهل الشرك فهى فى ايديهم اليوم وان طارقا انما اصاب المايدة فيها والله اعلم وكان لذريق تملك الفى ميل من الساحل الى ما ورى ذلك واصاب الناس غنايما كثيرة من الذهب والفضة ثنا ع. ر. قا ثنا ع. م. ب. م. قا ثنا الليث بن سعد ان كانت الطنفسة لتوجد منسوجة بقضبان الذهب بنظم[1]) السلسلة من الذهب باللولو او الياقوت والزبرجد وكان البربر ربما وجدوها فلا يستطيعون حملها حتى ياتوا بالفاس فيضرب وسطها فياخذ احدهما نصفها والاخر نصفها لانفسهم وتسير[2]) معهم جماعة والناس مشتغلون بغير ذلك ثنا ع. ر. قا ثنا ع. م. قا ثنا الليث بن سعد قال لما فتحت الاندلس جآ انسان الى موسى ابن نصير فقال ابعثوا معى ادلكم على كنز فبعث معه فقال لهم الرجل انزعوا هاهنا قال فنزعوا قال فسال عليهم من الزبرجد والياقوت شى لم يروا مثله قط فلما راوه تهيبوه وقالوا لا يصدقنا موسى ابن نصير فارسلوا اليه حتى جآ ونظر اليه ثنا ع. ر. قا ثنا ع. م. ب. م. قا ثنا الليث بن سعد ان موسى ابن نصير حين فتح الاندلس كتب الى ع. ا. انها ليس بالفتوح ولكنه[3]) الحشر ثنا ع. ر. قا ثنا ع. م. ب. م. قا ثنا ملك ابن انس عن

1) C. 1 reads ينظم.

2) C. 1 reads وسير instead of وتسير.

3) C. 1. reads ولكن for ولكنه, the latter is more correct. see Ewaldi Grammatica Critica Linguae arabicae, Vol. II, §. 671.

الغنايم فكتب موسى الى الوليد بن ع. م. يعلم ذلك وبجله نفسه وكتب موسى الى طارق الا يجاوز قرطبه حتى يقدم عليه [1]) وشتمه شتما قبيحا ثم خرج موسى بن نصير الى الاندلس فى رجب سنة ثلث وتسعين[16]) بوجوه العرب والموالى وعرفآ البربر حتى دخل الاندلس وخرج مغيظا على طارق وخرج معه حبيب ابن ابى عبيدة الفهرى [17]) واستخلف على القيروان ابنه عبد الله بن موسى وكان اسن ولده فاجاز من الخضرآ ثم مضى الى قرطبه فتلقاه طارق فترضاه وقال له انما انا مولاك وهذا الفتح لك فجمع موسى من الاموال ما لا يقدر على صفته ودفع طارق كلما غنم اليه قال ويقال بل توجه لدريق الى طارق وهو فى الجبل [2]) فلما انتهى اليه لدريق خرج اليه طارق ولدريق يوميذ على سرير مُلكه والسرير بين بغلين يحملانه [3]) وعليه تاجه وقفازاه [4]) وجميع ما كانت الملوك قبله تلبسه من الحلية فخرج اليه طارق واصحابه رجالة كلهم ليس فيهم راكب فاقتتلوا من حين نزغت الشمس الى ان غربت وظنوا انه العنا [5]) فقتل الله لدريق ومن معه وفتح للمسلمين ولم يكن بالمغرب

1) C. 1 reads عليك instead of عليه, the latter is correct, otherwise the preceding verb must be changed from the 3rd person singular to the 1st person.

2) C. 1 reads الخبل which gives no meaning in this sentence; we therefore follow the reading الجبل of C. 2.

3) C. 1 adds عليه, which word here is wholly unnecessary.

4) C. 2 reads قفازاه, which is the dual of قفاز and signifies ornaments for the hands and feet. Weil p. 523 translates the word a screen for the head, „ein Schirm bedeckte sein Haupt“. C. 1 reads قفازلهُ; the word is not explained in Dozy's Dictionnaire des noms des vetements chez les Arabes.

5) C. 2 reads الفنا instead of العنا.

حتى بلغوا مدينة قرطبة وبلغ ذلك لدريق فزحف اليهم من طليطلة فالتقوا بموضع يقال له شدونة[13]) على وادى يقال له اليوم وادى ام حكيم فاقتتلوا قتالا شديدا فقتل الله عز وجل لدريق[14]) ومن كان معه وكان مغيب[1]) الرومى[2]) غلام الوليد بن عبد الملك على خيل طارق فزحف معتب الرومى يريد قرطبة ومضى طارق الى طليطلة فدخلها وسال عن المايدة ولم يكن له هم غيرها وهى مايدة سليان بن داود صلوات الله عليه التى يزعم اهل الكتاب ىىا ع. ر. قا ىىا يحيى بن بكير قا ىىا الليث ابن سعد قال فتح لموسى بن نصير الاندلس فاخذ منها مايدة سليمان ابن داود[15]) والتاج فقيل لطارق ان المايدة بقلعة يقال لها فراس على مسيرة يومين من طليطلة وعلى القلعة ابن اخت للدريق فبعث اليه طارق بامانه وامان اهل بيته فنزل اليه فامنه ووفا له فقال له طارق ادفع المايدة فدفعها اليه وفيها من الذهب والجوهر ما لم ير مثله فقلع طارق رجلا من ارجُلها بما فيها من الجوهر والذهب وجعل لها رجلا سواها فقوّمت المايدة بمايتى الف دينار لما فيها من الجوهر واخذ طارق ما كان عنده من الجوهر والسلاح والذهب والفضة والانية واصاب سوى ذلك من الاموال ما لم ير مثله فحوى ذلك كله ثم انصرف الى قرطبة واقام بها وكتب الى موسى ابن نصير يعلمه بفتح الاندلس وما اصاب من

---

this connexion, we have therefore preferred the reading للذى راو of C. 2.

1) C. 1 reads معتب for مغيب. The only difference in these readings is the position of the points; in p. ٩ there is another reading, مغيث, and this is the more common as well as the more correct.

2) The words غلام الوليد بن عبد الملك are left out in C. 1.

نفر من جنده فتلك الجزيرة يوميذ تسمى جزيرة ام حكيم قد كان المسلمون حين نزلوا الجزيرة وجدوا بها كرامين ولم يكن بها غيرهم فاخذوهم ثم عمدوا الى رجل من الكرامين[1]) فذبحوه ثم عضوه وطبخوه ومن بقى من اصحابه ينظرون وقد كانوا طبخوا لحمًا فى قدور أُخر فلما ادركت طرحوا ما كان طبخوه من لحم ذلك الرجل ولايُعلم بطرحهم له واكلوا اللحم الذى[1]) كانوا طبخوه ومن بقى من الكرامين ينظرون فلم يشكوا انهم[2]) انما ياكلون لحم صاحبهم ثم ارسلوا من بقى منهم فاخبروا اهل الاندلس انهم ياكلون لحم الناس واخبروهم ما صنع بالكرام قال وكان بالاندلس كما ثنا ع. ر. قا ثنا ابى ع. ا. بن عبد الحكم وهشام ابن اسحاق بيت[2]) عليه اقفال لا يلى ملك منهم الا زاد عليه قفلا من عنده حتى كان الملك الذى دخل عليه المسلمون فانهم ارادوه على ان يجعل عليه قفلا كما كانت تصنع الملوك قبله فابى وقال[3]) لا اضع عليه شيا حتى اعرف ما فيه فامر بفتحه فاذا فيه صور العرب وفيه كتاب اذا فتح هذا الباب[4]) دخل هولا القوم هذا البلد ثم رجع الى حديث عثمن وغيره قال فلما جاز طارق تلقته جنود قُرطبة[5]) واحقروا عليه للذى راو[6]) من قلة اصحابه فاقتتلوا فاشتد قتالهم ثم انهزموا فلم يزل يقتلهم

1) C. 1 reads الذين for الذى, the latter is more correct, referring to لحم.

2) C. 2 adds انما.

3) C. 2 adds ما كنت.

4) C. 1 reads الكتاب for الباب.

5) واخبروا stands in the ms., but that reading gives no sense in this sentence; we have therefore read احقروا for اخبروا.

6) C. 1 reads الذين دلوا, the second word gives no sense in

مما يلى طنجه وكان بليان يودى الطاعة الى لذريق صاحب الانــدلـــس
وكان لذريق يسكن طليطله فراسل طارق بليان ولاطفه حتى تهــادنا[1])
وكان بليان قد بعث بابنة له الى لذريق صاحب الاندلس ليوذبـــهـــا
ويعلمها فاحبلها فبلغ ذلك بليان فقال لا ارى له عقوبة ولا مكفاة الا ان
ادخل العرب عليه فبعث الى طارق انى مدخلك الاندلس وطارق يوميذ
بتلمسين[8]) وموسى بن نصير بالقيروان[9]) فقال طارق لا اطمأن اليك حتى
تبعث الىّ برهينة فبعث بابنتيه ولم يكن له ولد غيرهما فاقرهما طارق
بتلمسين واستوثق منهما ثم خرج طارق الى بليان وهو بسبتـــه عـــلى
المجاز ففرح به حين قدم عليه فقال له انا مدخلك الانـدلـــس وكان
فيها بين المجازين جبل يقال له اليوم جبل طارق فيما بين سبـــتـــه
والاندلس فلما امسى جآه بليان بالمراكب فحمله فيها الى ذلك المجـــاز
فاكمن فيه نهاره فلما امسى رد المراكب الى من بقى[2]) من اصحابه فحملوا
اليه حتى لم يبق منهم احد ولا بشعر بهم اهل الاندلس ولا يظنـــون
الا ان المراكب تختلف بمثل ما كانت تختلف به من منافعـهـم وكان
طارق فى اخر فوج ركب فجاز الى اصحابه وتخلف بليان ومن كان معه من
التجار بالخضرآ ليكون اطيب لانفس اصحابه واهل بلده وبلغ خبر طارق[10])
ومن معه اهل الاندلس ومكانهم الذى هم به وتوجه طارق فسلــك
باصحابه على قنطرة من الجبل الى قرية يقال لها قرطاجنه وزحف يريـــد
قُرطبةَ ثمّ بجزيرة فى البحر فخلف بها جارية له يقال لها ام حكيم ومعها

used by Arabic writers to designate the place, where the Moslems first landed on Spanish ground.

1) C. 1 reads تهاديا they exchanged presents.

2) C. 1 reads مر بقى, the reading of C. 2 is preferable.

ذكر فتح الاندلس[1]

قال ووجه موسى بن نصير ابنه مروان بن موسى الى طنجه مرابطاً على ساحلها فجهد هو واصحابه فانصرف وخلف على جيشه طارق ابن عمرو وكانوا الفاً وسبعماية ويقال بل كان مع طارق اثنى عشر الفا من البربر الا ستة عشر رجلا من العرب وليس ذلك بالصحيح ويقال ان موسى ابن نصير خرج من افريقيه غازيا الى طنجه وهو الاول من نزل طنجه من الولاة وبها من البربر[2]) بطون من البتر[3]) والبرانس[1]) ممن لم يكن دخل الطاعة فلما دنا من طنجه بث السرايا فانتهت خيله الى السوس الادنى[4]) فوطيهم وسباهم وادوا اليه الطاعة وولى عليهم واليا احسن فيهم السيرة ووجّه ابن بشر بن ابى ارطاه الى قلعة من مدينة قيروان على ثلثة ايام فافتتحها وسبا الذرية وغنم الاموال فسميت قلعة بشر فهى لا تعرف الا به الى اليوم ثم ان موسى عزل الذى كان استعمله على طنجه وولى طارق ابن زياد ثم انصرف الى قيروان وكان طارق قد خرج بجارية له يقال لها ام حكيم فاقام طارق هنالك مرابطاً زماناً وذلك فى سنة ثنتين وتسعين وكان المجاز الذى بينه وبين اهل الاندلس عليه رجل من العجم يقال له بليان[5]) صاحب سبته[6]) وكان على مدينة على المجاز الى الاندلس يقال لها[7]) الخضرآ[2])

---

1) ابتر والبرانس. The words are written النمر والمراس in Ewald's ms., and Weil p. 288 reads Tibr and Niras. But the tribes that are here meant, are probably the El-Botr and El-Beranes. See note 2 and n. 31 of this treatise.

2) C. 2 adds الخضيرا, the words جزيرة الخضرآ are generally